DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 239 UD 011 697

AUTHOR	Dailey, John T.; Neyman, Clinton A., Jr.
TITLE	Evaluation of ESEA Title I Programs for the District of Columbia, Summer 1967. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 68
NOTE	100p.; Prepared by the George Washington University Education Research Project
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Preparation, *Compensatory Education Programs, Counseling Programs, Disadvantaged Youth, Elementary Education, Enrichment Programs, Federal Programs, *Program Evaluation, Recreational Programs, Secondary Education, *Summer Programs, Summer Schools, Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	District of Columbia, *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

These studies were undertaken to evaluate the 1967 summer school programs in the District of Columbia funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. There were 18 different Title I programs, involving approximately 15,000 students. There were two main aspects of the evaluation: (1) the statistical aspects included a record of student participation in the various programs, and information about the programs obtained from certain sections of the following data-gathering instruments: Student Evaluation Forms, Administrator Questionnaires, Teacher Questionnaires, and Student Questionnaires; and, (2) the nonstatistical aspects included discussion of the summer programs with administrative personnel, site visits to the program activities, and information about the programs and their operation from administrators, teachers, and students, obtained from the questionnaires and other sources. The various Title I summer programs were assigned three levels of priority. Among "priority one" programs, making definite contributions toward better schooling of the students from low-income areas, were Instrumental Music, Model School Division Junior High School and Teacher Training Institute, Primary Summer School, Social Adjustment, and Summer Camping. "Priority two" programs had merit but were not as significant as "priority one" programs. "Priority three" programs were low-priority. (Author/JM)

ED053239

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS
for the District of Columbia - Summer 1967

Final Report

Government of the District of Columbia
Contract No. NS-6837

March 1968

John T. Dailey
Clinton A. Neyman, Jr.

UD011697

Education Research Project
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS
for the District of Columbia - Summer 1967

Contract No. NS-6837

ABSTRACT

PURPOSE

To evaluate the 1967 summer school programs in the District of Columbia funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. There were 18 different Title I programs, involving approximately 15,000 students.

PROCEDURE

This evaluation is a continuation of the studies made of the Title I programs in the District of Columbia during the summer of 1966 and the 1966-67 school year, carried out by the Education Research Project of The George Washington University.* There were two main aspects of the evaluation: (1) The statistical aspects included a record of student participation in the various programs, and information about the programs obtained from certain sections of the following data-gathering instruments: Student Evaluation Forms, Administrator Questionnaires, Teacher Questionnaires, and Student Questionnaires. (2) The nonstatistical aspects included discussion of the summer programs with administrative personnel, site visits to the program activities, and information about the programs and their operation from administrators, teachers, and students, obtained from the questionnaires and other sources.

RESULTS

This evaluation should be considered as interim in nature, subject to confirmation as to the actual effectiveness of these programs in changing student performance and attitude when measures of school performance and teacher evaluations are available at the end of the 1967-68 school year.

The following programs were judged to be most effective in contributing to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in the target area: Priority 1-A (in alphabetical order) -- Instrumental

---

* Dailey, J.T., & Neyman, C.A., Jr., "Evaluation of ESEA Title I Programs for the District of Columbia, 1966 and 1967," Final Report to District of Columbia Government Contracts NS-66416 and NS-6870, Washington, D.C.: Education Research Project, George Washington University, December 1967.

Music, Model School Division Junior High School and Teacher Training Institute, Primary Summer School, Pupil Personnel Services Teams, Social Adjustment, STAY, Summer Camping, and Webster Girls School; Priority 1-B -- Secondary School Enrichment, Summer Occupational Orientation, and Vocational Orientation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that every possible effort be made to plan the summer school programs well in advance of the opening of the session, since this is necessary in order to enroll students in appropriate programs, to obtain adequate qualified staff, to obtain the necessary supplies, and to work out the details of program operation.

It is also recommended that there be better coordination of the summer programs -- e.g., the Occupational and Vocational Orientation programs and the Secondary School Enrichment program. Greater effort should be made to involve a larger percentage of Title I target-area students who have been "identified" as potential dropouts. Means should be sought to involve parents and communities to a greater extent. Programs being offered should be publicized more so that the parents and communities are more aware of the activities of the schools.

It is further recommended that those programs which have not demonstrated positive effects should either be dropped or changed in ways that will make them more effective, and new programs should be developed to meet specific needs not met by other programs.

However, final decisions with regard to continuation or modification of low priority summer programs should await analysis of the effects of these programs on classroom performance and attitude as measured by the teachers during the current school year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

Abstract

Table of Contents

List of Tables

I. Purpose of the Research 1

II. Background and Introduction 1

III. Procedure 2

IV. Description of Programs 4

- 410 Social Adjustment 6
- 420 Webster Girls School 9
- 430 STAY 12
- 440 Joint Public and Parochial Program--15-12 14
- 450 Junior High College Prep--Gonzaga 16
- 460 Summer Scholarships:
  - 461 Sociology Seminar - National Cathedral School 18
  - 462 International Seminars - St. Albans School 21
  - 463 The Heights Study Camp 23
  - 464 Institute of Languages - Georgetown University 25
- 470 Summer Occupational Orientation 28
- 480 Pupil Personnel Title I Team 31
- 500 Primary Summer School 34
- 520 Theater Workshops 37
- 530 Georgetown College Orientation 39
- 540 Secondary School Enrichment 41
- 550 Morning Physical Fitness 43
- 560 Special Orientation for Sixth Graders 45
- 570 Summer Camping 47
- 580 Instrumental Music 50
- 600 Vocational Orientation 54
- 610 Junior High Summer School and Teacher Training Institute (Model School Division) 56

V. Analysis of Data 58

- A. Student Evaluation Form 58
- B. Administrator and Teacher Questionnaires 61
- C. Student Questionnaires and Themes 63
- D. Limitations of the Analysis 65

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

Page No.

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations 65
  Assignment of Priorities 66
  Recommendations 71
  Recommendations for Future Research 72

Appendix A A-1
  Table A-1

Appendix B
  Forms: Student Evaluation Form
    Administrator Questionnaire
    Teacher Questionnaire
    Student Questionnaire

LIST OF TABLES

Page No.

Table 1. Enrollment, Funds Allotted, and Cost per Pupil - Title I Programs - Summer 1967 5

Table 2. 1967 Summer Programs Showing Total Enrollment, Percentage from Title I Schools, and Means and Standard Deviations for a Sample of Teacher Evaluations of Students in Each Program 59

Table 3. Comparison of Teacher Evaluations for Students in Title I Programs in the Summers of 1966 and 1967 . . . 60

Table 4. Comparison of Summer School Program Teacher or Instructor Evaluations with Regular School Year Teacher Evaluations 62

Table 5. Program Objectives, in Rank Order, as Obtained from Administrator and Teacher Questionnaires 64

Appendix

Table A-1. Data Collected - Summer 1967 Programs A-1

EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

for the District of Columbia - Summer 1967

I. PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of the research was to evaluate the 1967 summer school programs in the District of Columbia funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10. There were eighteen different Title I programs involving approximately fifteen thousand students ranging from Primary Summer School to College Preparatory programs.

II. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

This evaluation is a continuation of a series of studies made by the Education Research Project of the George Washington University of ESEA Title I programs in the District of Columbia in the summer of 1966 and the school year 1966-67. Approximately 24,000 educationally deprived children were involved in over fifty Title I programs and services. The primary objective of these studies was to obtain estimates of changes in student performance and behavior which were uniquely related to these programs and services.

In order to carry out the evaluation, data were gathered for the construction of a statistical model. These data consisted of lists of names of students who had participated in various Title I programs or who had been affected by Title I services both during the summer of 1966 and during the school year of 1966-67, and teacher evaluations of various student characteristics first in May 1966 and again in May 1967. Other information was obtained from regular and special administration of standardized tests, as well as specially designed data-gathering instruments. The result of this evaluation will be found in the Technical Report to this previous study,* which is based upon a data bank containing over 80,000 records of students in the D.C. schools with information obtained from over 200,000 documents.

---

* Dailey, J.T., & Neyman, C.A., Jr., "Evaluation of ESEA Title I Programs for the District of Columbia, 1966 and 1967," Final Report to District of Columbia Government Contracts No. NS-66416 and NS-6870, Washington, D.C.: Education Research Project, the George Washington University, December 1967.

III. PROCEDURE

There were two main aspects to this evaluation - the statistical and the nonstatistical. Each aspect required a different treatment.

A. Statistical Procedure

Data were obtained about the summer school students and the programs they were in, using the following data-gathering instruments:

1. Rosters of students who had participated in the various programs. This involved visiting the programs to transcribe the names and other available information about the students. These data will be punched on IBM cards and added to the Title I master information file collected from previous studies.

2. Student Evaluation Form (SEF). This form was distributed to most of the Title I programs to be filled out on each student by the teacher or instructor. The information on these forms will be punched on IBM cards for comparison with the reevaluation of these students by their regular classroom teachers in April 1968. A copy of the Student Evaluation Form is included in Appendix B.

This form was developed for use in the evaluation of ESEA Title I programs for the District of Columbia schools during the years 1966 and 1967. The SEF was also used during the summer of 1966. The primary difference between the evaluations being reported in this study and those obtained from the regular school teachers is that the summer school teachers or instructors who do the evaluations must usually base their ratings upon their knowledge of the students obtained from only six weeks of observation, as compared to the whole school year for regular teachers. In addition, summer school usually has a much more permissive atmosphere than the regular school, so there is not so much pressure toward conformance with the rules or other standards. Another factor that affects ratings is that summer school teachers have no continuing responsibility for these students. The importance of these evaluations, however, lies in the comparison they can give between the response of students to summer school, considering the above limitations, as compared with regular school. This may give insights as to methods or techniques for improving instruction or motivation.

3. Administrator Questionnaire. This questionnaire asked the program administrators to describe the program and its objectives, the kinds of students served, the staff, and the problems encountered. It also asked for a statement about recommended changes, and attached a checklist of possible program objectives. A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

4. Teacher Questionnaire. Each teacher or instructor in the summer programs was asked to fill out this questionnaire. It asked for such things as a brief description of the program and its objectives, the problems encountered and how resolved, and recommendations for the improvement of the program. There was also a checklist of possible program objectives. In addition, the teachers were asked to describe the greatest challenges and rewards they found from participation in the program. A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

5. Student Questionnaire. Students in the seventh grade and above were requested to fill in a questionnaire about their opinions of summer school. These questionnaires were intended to be a guide to the program administrators in determining student reaction to their experiences during the summer. There were eight questions concerning various aspects of summer school, such as what did they like best, or least, and how the experience was different than expected. In addition, these students were asked to write a short theme on the subject "What School Means to Me." This was the same subject used for themes written by a sample of students during the regular evaluation in school year 1966-67 as well as during the summer of 1966. The primary purpose for these themes was to obtain a measure of attitude and reaction to school and society, to compare with that obtained during the previous summer. See Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire.

B. Nonstatistical Procedure

1. Members of the staff of the Education Research Project acquainted themselves with the various Title I summer programs by discussions with the staff of the D.C. Schools research department and administrators of the various programs.

2. Visits were made to the various projects for the purpose of interviewing the program directors, observing the programs in operation, and making arrangements for obtaining the necessary statistical information as indicated previously.

3. Nonstatistical information concerning the operations of the programs was obtained from the administrators, teachers, and students, as contained in the questionnaires received from them at the end of the summer programs.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS

The various Title I programs funded either wholly or in part by funds from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended, have been described using the following format:

Description and Objectives -- This section is based upon the objectives as stated in the budget request with statements of the program administrators and teachers and observations of the Project staff added.

Staff -- As listed by the administrator of the programs.

Participants -- A brief description of the kinds of students involved in the programs, with a statement as to how they were selected when this is important to understanding the operation or effectiveness of the programs.

Problems -- This section is usually based upon the comments of the administrators and teachers. Only those constructive suggestions have been included which were deemed useful for the improvement of the programs for future consideration. Problems observed by the Project staff are also included.

Cost per Pupil -- Costs were very difficult to determine, as the accounting for any program is not completed until some time after the report is submitted. At best, the costs are estimates arrived at jointly through the best judgment of the Project staff and members of the District of Columbia Schools administration.

The number of pupils enrolled in the program is also an estimate. This is because it had to be determined whether to use the maximum number enrolled in the program, the average daily attendance, the attendance on some specific day, or the number who completed the program. For purposes of this evaluation, the number of students who completed the program and on whom evaluative information was available was usually used to obtain the cost per pupil figure.

Recommendations -- These recommendations, like the problems, come primarily from the remarks of the program administrators and teachers, with additions by the Project staff resulting from observations, interviews, and conferences.

Table 1 lists the Title I programs during the summer of 1967 and shows the enrollment, funds allotted, and approximate cost per pupil.

TABLE 1

Enrollment, Funds Allotted, and Cost per Pupil
Title I Programs - Summer 1967

Code	Program	Enrollment	Title I Funds Allotted	Approx. Cost Per Pupil
410	Social Adjustment	327	$28,298	$ 86.50
420	Webster Girls School	53	10,466	197.50
430	STAY	435	15.782	36.50
440	Joint Public & Parochial--15-12	175	35,016	200.00
450	JHS College Prep--Gonzaga	89	11,000	123.50
460	Summer Scholarships:			
461	Sociology Seminars--National Cathedral School	9	2,700	300.00
462	International Seminars--St. Albans School	32	4,493	140.50
463	Summer Seminar--Heights School	3	90	30.00
464	Institute of Languages--Georgetown University	93	6,975	75.00
470	Summer Occupational Orientation	279	27,962	100.00
480	Pupil Personnel Services	(17,437)	43,188	2.50
500	Primary Summer School	4,953	408,401	82.50
520	Theater Workshops	54	12,000	222.00
530	Georgetown College Orientation	52	30,000	577.00
540	Secondary School Enrichment	782	25,572	33.00
550	Morning Physical Fitness	947	34,803	37.00
560	Special Orientation for 6th Graders	335	22,848	68.00
570	Summer Camping	902	53,230	59.00
580	Instrumental Music	530	12,200	23.00
600	Vocational Orientation	355	19,800	56.00
610	MSD JHS & Teacher Training Institute	143	19,067	Not applicable
		10,548 Total	$823,891 Total	$78.11 Average

SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

This program was composed entirely of students who had been in special Social Adjustment classes during the regular school year because of inability to adjust and relate positively with their peers, teachers, and authorities. The summer program was designed to give these students who had missed regular classes at their grade levels a chance to make up the academic work in a six-week summer program so they could be promoted to the next grade level upon successful completion of the summer program. Through a more relaxed atmosphere, inventive and creative approaches toward subject-matter, interesting field trips and films, and a more personal student-teacher relationship, an attempt was made to foster a liking for and a desire to continue in school. School situations were presented close to those of regular school but with additions and changes designed to create an atmosphere in which socially maladjusted students could strengthen their skills in order to reach the necessary level to enter the proper grade for their age, improve their mental health, receive cultural enrichment, and minimize their hostilities through counseling, guidance, interest, and understanding.

The program was designed to assist the students to discover their interests, abilities, and aptitudes; to help them develop a better understanding of themselves and others; and to convince them that they were expected as citizens of our society to conform to accepted standards of behavior (since they had not learned this at home). In order to accomplish these objectives, demonstration and individual teaching techniques were used, intensive subject-matter activity as well as guidance and cultural enrichment were provided, and many "project-type" activities were included because this kind of student responds to skill-type activities with interest and enthusiasm.

The boys' section of the Social Adjustment Program met at Terrell and the girls' at Browne. Subjects offered were art, English, a foreign language, geography, mathematics, science, business, typewriting, sewing, and a shop course. Each student selected four of these courses. Classes were small, so that much individual attention was possible. Field trips were made to museums, parks, historical sites, plays, and restaurants. Free lunch was included in the program.

STAFF

The staff included the director who headed the program at Terrell, and her assistant who headed the program at Browne. There were ten teachers, two teacher-aides, one librarian, and one counselor at each center. The director at Terrell was a Social Adjustment teacher in the winter session; the director at Browne was a junior high school counselor during the winter session. The teachers were selected by the Supervising Director for Special Programs, and most had had previous training or experience with this type of student and/or program.

PARTICIPANTS

Participants were 7th and 8th graders who had problems in adjusting to regular classroom situations. Students were recommended by the counselor of each Title I junior high school and came from all parts of the city. Of the 268 students who completed the program, 68 were girls.

PROBLEMS

Problems listed by teachers and administrators on their questionnaires included the following:

1. Absenteeism and tardiness.

2. Discipline, particularly at the beginning of the program (profanity, blatant disobedience, complete disrespect for authority, lack of self-control).

3. Poor motivation of students -- keeping their interest (one teacher concluded that this was really a lack of understanding because of poor backgrounds of the children).

4. Classes too large (at Terrell) -- not enough opportunity for individual attention, and ability levels within classes too wide.

5. Students' lack of confidence that they could achieve anything.

6. Too few counselors for this type of student.

7. Complete lack of materials -- orders not received until program was almost over -- instructor (shop) had to buy supplies with his own money (which, because his money was limited, were quite inadequate).

8. Lack of parental interest.

9. Lack of experience of some teachers with this type of student.

10. Transportation -- too long a trip for many students.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds: $28,298
Enrollment: 327
Cost per pupil: $86.50

RECOMMENDATIONS

Many recommendations were made by the teachers and administrators for improving the program. Some of them are listed below for consideration:

1. Add special reading classes.

2. Teach more job-preparatory subjects in skill areas, such as electricity, printing, shoe repair, etc.

3. Add more "project-type" activities, since the students showed real interest and enthusiasm and worked diligently on this type of effort. More creative work, music, role-playing, etc.

4. Have stricter rules, less coddling -- teach the students that deprivation and indecency do not have to go hand in hand.

5. Have stricter rules on attendance and tardiness.

6. Offer program at more schools, so that transportation will not take so long.

7. Add more professional staff, counselors, and teacher-aides (students have to be supervised at all times, which is sometimes difficult with only one teacher).

8. Have shorter class periods (50 minutes too long during summer).

9. Extend the program for longer than six weeks.

10. Have smaller classes (e.g., 8:1), since these children need more individual attention.

11. Set aside specific time for individual student-teacher or student-counselor conferences.

12. Add teachers of communication skills.

13. Add group-guidance on personal-social problems as part of curriculum.

14. Have in-service courses for teachers, particularly those without previous experience with this type of student and program.

15. Select teachers and have funds available long enough beforehand so that materials can be available the first day of school, and also so the teachers can familiarize themselves with students' records before school begins

16. Plan and supervise field trips better (control is difficult, so fewer students per trip would be better). Confine field trips to those students who are doing satisfactory academic work, because most of them need concentration on academic work.

17. Involve parents more.

WEBSTER GIRLS SCHOOL

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

This program was designed to enable school-age pregnant girls to continue their education while awaiting delivery of their children and to encourage them to complete their high school education after the birth of their children. The six-week summer program was a continuation of the one offered during the regular school year.

The school, one of a few of its kind in the United States, began as an experimental program in the fall of 1963, financed by a grant from the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This grant expired in 1966, and the program was then financed through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The girls attend this school from the time they are required to leave the regular school until at least six weeks following delivery -- a period of four to six months.

The primary objectives of this program are:

1. To help the girls keep up in the required school curriculum while awaiting the birth of their children.
2. To provide visiting teachers for home instruction when the girls cannot attend school because of illness.
3. To provide prenatal care and instruction.
4. To provide psychological help when necessary.
5. To provide social service help to the girls and their parents.

The curriculum at Webster in the regular year program was primarily academic. Special classes, however, were given in nutrition and child care, and the girls received regular physical examinations and were aided by psychologists and social workers to help them understand and prepare for a better future. The summer program included field trips and enrichment activities.

In the summer of 1967, courses were offered in typing, science enrichment, government and civics, and a language arts program.

STAFF

There were on the summer 1967 staff of the Webster Girls School:

Teachers:

1 English
2 Social Studies
1 Math
1 Science
2 Business

1 Social worker
1 Counselor
1 Nurse
1 Nutritionist
1 Obstetrician

PARTICIPANTS

There were 53 girls who attended the summer program. This was less than the expected enrollment because construction work on the regular building necessitated having the summer program at Paul Junior High School, and this location proved to be inaccessible for many of the girls.

This program served girls from the 7th through the 12th grades. Priority for selection in the winter program was made on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Those under 16 in the early months of pregnancy.

2. All others under 16.

3. Those 16 and over in early stages of pregnancy.

4. Students needing junior or senior high school course completions for credit toward graduation.

In the summer program, priority was given to students whose school work during the winter session was incomplete or failing, and to newly entered cases.

PROBLEMS

This year's summer program had special problems because of the location. There was student dissatisfaction with transportation to the school.

Questionnaires completed by the teachers and the students show that both the teachers and the students felt there was too much emphasis in the summer program on the field trips and not enough on the academic areas. The teachers said there was not enough class time available to cover the subject matter, and the teachers also expressed the need for better organization of the type of field trips taken so they would supplement the classroom work. The students expressed the need for greater emphasis on the academic so they could keep up with the required subject work to reenter a regular school or to graduate.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$10,466
Enrollment:	53
Cost per pupil:	$197.50

RECOMMENDATIONS

In future summer programs, it is recommended that there be a better balance between the enrichment activities and the academic. It would be advantageous if there also could be a better balance between the amount of funds allotted for enrichment activities during the winter and the summer programs.

Allotment of funds should be made earlier so there could be better selection of the type of trips taken.

STAY PROGRAM TO REHABILITATE DROPOUTS

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The STAY (School to Aid Youth) program is a result of efforts of the District of Columbia to help rehabilitate students between the ages of 16 and 21 who dropped out of school in grades 9 to 12. The program was designed to provide a way for students to return to regular school programs and to assist them in readjusting to the routine of school. With successful achievement, along with punctual and regular attendance in the STAY program, the students were given a strong recommendation to return to their regular school at the grade level for which they were best qualified. If the students were not able to return to the regular school program, they could complete the academic requirements for a diploma and graduate from the STAY program.

The curriculum at STAY included all courses required to earn a high school diploma and was so arranged that a student could earn in a half year (one semester) the number of units normally earned in regular day school during a complete year (two semesters). Intensive counseling and job conditioning were daily efforts in the operation of the STAY program. The STAY school day began at 3:45 p.m. and ended at 9:45 p.m. This schedule permitted many students to work during the day or to carry out responsibilities at home.

An innovative and very successful addition to the STAY program was initiated in 1967 - the establishment of a nursery school to care for the students' children while they attended classes. The lack of child care was a major problem for many students at STAY and a cause of absenteeism. Under the supervision of the Home Economics teacher and school nurse, designated members of the Home Economics class tended to the routine care of the children. The children ranged in age from 6 months to 3 years.

The STAY program was honored in 1967 by the National Education Association and Parade Magazine as a program "for leading the way to better education for America's youth."

STAFF

Administrative:

- 1 Principal
- 1 Assistant principal
- 2 Counselors
- 1 Nurse
- 1 Librarian
- 1 Registrar
- 1 Book clerk
- 3 Teacher-aides

Teaching:

- 5 English teachers
- 2 Social Studies teachers
- 9 Peace Corps (VISTA) trainees
- 2 Math teachers
- 1 Office machines and typing teacher
- 1 Typing teacher
- 1 Spanish teacher
- 1 Home Economics teacher
- 1 Child Care teacher

Selection and assignments were made by the Board of Examiners of the District of Columbia Public Schools.

#430 STAY
Continued

PARTICIPANTS

Any boy or girl between the ages of 16 and 21 who had dropped out of school and was interested in earning a high school diploma could attend the STAY program. The student must have a recommendation from a previous school, not be considered a severe disciplinary problem, and have completed the 8th grade.

About three times as many girls as boys attending the program have met the requirements for graduation from high school. During the summer of 1967 there were 435 students in the STAY program. No check was made as to how many of them came from Title I target-area schools.

PROBLEMS

1. Some of the students held jobs which conflicted with the first class period at 3:40 p.m. Many employers cooperated with the school when the difficulty was made known to them and allowed the students to be released early from their job.

2. Many students needed jobs. Two job counselors interviewed and placed many students.

3. There was a problem in securing records for STAY students from their former high schools. This problem was presented at various principals' meetings, with some assurance of better future cooperation.

4. Many students had baby-sitting problems. The establishment of a nursery to care for the students' children while they attended class helped to alleviate this problem. This nursery was run as a part of an instructional program in child care and home economics.

5. Difficulty was experienced in obtaining and retaining good teachers because of the unusual hours and the part-time nature of the work.

COST PER PUPIL

Funds allotted: $15,782
Enrollment: 435
Cost per pupil: $36.50

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the STAY program be expanded and become part of the regular secondary program in other areas of the city.

/

JOINT PUBLIC AND PAROCHIAL PROGRAM -- 15-12

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The 15-12 Public and Parochial Program was a full-day summer program for an eight-week period, offering experiences in language arts, health education, creative use of leisure, and homemaking for girls aged 12-15 years.

The program was conducted at Hine Junior High School. Many of the girls in this area have the responsibility of motherhood in caring for younger brothers and sisters before their own childhood needs have been met. The 15-12 program, through music, art, drama, language arts, and small discussion groups, attempted to meet some of the needs of these girls to experience beauty and to be creative.

An attempt was made to bring about greater understanding between the girl and her parents through the efforts of the counselor and through home visits made by the staff.

The subject matter of the program was presented in an informal setting rather than in a more structured way. In home economics, areas were covered in which girls need information, such as choosing and making clothing, consumer education, and baby-sitting. In art, the girls made tours of the art galleries in Washington to gain an appreciation of various art styles. Then they were encouraged to paint and draw according to their inner feelings. In drama, the girls learned to read plays and then act them out. In music, a glee club was formed. Learning the history of Negro spirituals was part of the program. In a seminar reading program, paperback books and *The Washington Post* were used in tutoring to meet individual needs of the students.

STAFF

On the staff from the District of Columbia Public Schools were:

1 Assistant Principal
1 Counselor
1 Home Economics teacher
1 Librarian
1 Physical education teacher
1 Music teacher
1 Drama teacher

On the staff from the Catholic Diocese of Washington, D.C., were:

1 Coordinator
26 Nuns
6 Seminarians
4 College students

PARTICIPANTS

There were 175 girls from public and parochial elementary and junior high schools enrolled in the program. This number varied as children had to report to clinics, take care of younger children, or when the weather was bad. There were also 13 students from Junior Village who attended the program.

Participants were obtained as a result of a brochure and a letter about the program sent from the Board of Education to all Title I schools before the end of the school year in 1967. Staff members also visited four junior high schools, eight public elementary schools, and two parochial schools, in the area near Hine Junior High School, to explain the program to girls who might be interested in attending the summer program.

PROBLEMS

Absenteeism was a problem. Home visits and telephone calls helped to reduce this somewhat.

Hostility was another problem. Some of the girls did not wish to communicate with adults, and refused to carry out directions. There was a most noticeable improvement as the weeks went by. The girls were reached through small discussion groups and individual tutoring.

Codes of behavior, e.g., acceptable table manners, were also a problem. This was overcome somewhat by visits to restaurants.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$35,016
Enrollment:	175
Cost per pupil:	$200

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that efforts be made to provide for the following items in future programs:

1. A wider choice of class activities.

2. A reading and speech specialist.

3. A more intensive orientation program for the staff.

4. Shorter hours. This year's program was held from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. A program from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. might have been better, especially on the humid days.

5. A child care program for the younger brothers and sisters of the students so that the girls in the 15-12 program could have more freedom to enjoy themselves.

JUNIOR HIGH COLLEGE PREP (GONZAGA)

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The Gonzaga Junior High College Prep program is one prime example of the cooperation between the public and parochial school systems. For the third year this program has operated under the direction of the Society of Jesus and Woodstock Seminary in Maryland.

This was a six-week program designed for 7th and 8th grade boys who were underachievers. The day was broken into five periods of 45 minutes each. The subjects taught were English literature, reading, writing, speech, and mathematics, with some afternoon and evening cultural and recreational activities. The teachers were allowed a great deal of freedom in techniques and materials, which provided an atmosphere for the teachers that inspired them to stimulate the students to the maximum. One of the teachers expressed his feelings about the program thus: "Our task is not merely to instruct but to motivate as well. Our program...is not really a six-week program, but a ten-year project. It will not be a complete success until each one of our students has completed a college education or more."

A follow-up program was planned for the fall and winter so that the boys who were in the program would not retrogress.

STAFF

The staff was composed of eleven people in addition to the administrator. Eight of these were full-time teachers, and the remaining three were pursuing graduate studies. Six of the teachers were from parochial schools and two were from public schools. Most of the teachers were from private Jesuit schools.

PARTICIPANTS

All the boys (45 8th graders and 35 9th graders) were selected because they had demonstrated college potential but were not developing it. The 8th-grade boys were selected from recommendations sent in by principals and counselors. Those boys entering the 9th grade were in the program during the summer of 1966. There were 12 boys from the 1966 class who were not invited to return.

Twenty-three percent of the boys came from Catholic parochial schools and 72% from public Title I schools.

PROBLEMS

Transportation to carry out the enrichment part of the program during the afternoon was difficult to obtain. If this is to be a major aspect of the program, provisions should be made for it.

COST PER PUPIL

Alloted funds:	$11,000
Enrollment:	89
Cost per pupil:	$124

RECOMMENDATIONS

Programs such as this are highly desirable, particularly to motivate underachievers having college potential. There is high likelihood that many of these boys may become leaders in their own groups. However, care must be taken in the selection of these boys to see that potential dropouts are being served and not those who would probably go to college anyway.

Some follow-up should be made of those 12 boys not invited back to the program as it would seem that these are the ones most likely to have problems which prevent staying in school and continuing on to college.

SUMMER SCHOLARSHIPS:
SOCIOLOGY SEMINAR, NATIONAL CATHEDRAL SCHOOL

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The National Cathedral School of Washington, D.C., conducted a Sociology Seminar for 28 high school girls from all over the United States from June 15 to July 8, 1967. The program was designed to offer an introduction to contemporary sociological issues through both study and field work by presenting an opportunity for high school girls to:

..study contemporary sociological issues
..meet with specialists from government and educational institutions
..use unique resources available only in the Nation's Capital
..take field trips to government agencies and points of interest in the Washington area
..attend concerts, plays, and other cultural events
..participate in field work in the inner city
..live and work with girls from many areas and backgrounds -- a college campus at the high school level

Scholarships to attend this seminar were awarded to nine high school girls from Title I public schools in the District of Columbia.

The group attending the seminar lived in the dormitory of the National Cathedral School, attended classes there, and did field work in the inner-city area of Washington during the afternoons.

The mornings were devoted to lecture and discussion. Guest speakers and outside resource leaders participated. Topics studied included:

The Individual in Contemporary Society
Increasing Urbanization and the Changing Role of the City
Poverty, Housing, Education, Juvenile Delinquency
The Role of the Federal Government in Planning for Future Development.

In the afternoons, the students participated in field work projects such as Head Start, and recreational and tutorial programs in the inner-city areas of Washington. Each girl chose her area of field work after orientation workshops. Her work was supervised, with opportunity for both group and individual evaluation.

Evenings were devoted to attending cultural events in Washington and preparing and presenting a children's operetta at housing projects and settlement houses in the inner city.

STAFF

The staff was composed of:

1 Director and teacher
1 Assistant Director and Head of Residence
1 Teacher
4 College-age Tutor-Counselors
1 Head of Drama
1 Psychologist
1 Social worker

All the administrative staff were selected from the National Cathedral School winter faculty. The psychologist was selected on recommendation of the National Cathedral School psychologist as a person with experience in dealing with inner-city children. All the staff were selected on the basis of ability to work with a diverse group, strength in certain areas (for example, sociology, teaching, or drama), and a genuine liking for young people.

A two-day staff orientation session was conducted preceding the seminar. Weekly staff meetings were held during the program.

PARTICIPANTS

There was a total of 28 girls in the program. Girls who had completed their sophomore, junior, or senior year in high school were eligible for the seminar. Each applicant submitted an application, a transcript, and a letter of recommendation from a principal, teacher, or counselor. Nine girls from Title I schools in the District of Columbia were also interviewed by the Director and the Staff Psychologist and were chosen on the basis of interest and apparent aptitude as well as on the basis of the supporting documents. Three of these girls had completed their senior year, four their junior year, and two their sophomore year.

All were considered to have college potential, but often did not have high achievement. In several instances, these girls had low reading scores. Special help in reading was given to some of the girls during the program.

PROBLEMS

The director of the program stated in her report that there was a problem of genuine communication between the girls from very different backgrounds, and particularly between the inner-city Negro girls of limited financial means and more financially fortunate white girls. The feeling that there was little genuine communication and discussion of "What it's like to live as I (you) do" arose early in the program. The staff made suggestions for overcoming barriers to communication and the tutor-counselors were particularly helpful. By the end of the program, the girls were able to be very frank and honest with each other, and also appeared to be aware of each other's feelings and problems.

#461 Sociology Seminar
National Cathedral School
Continued

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$2700
Enrollment:	9
Cost per pupil:	$300

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Make the program longer -- at least four or six weeks.

2. Restrict the program to girls who have completed the junior or senior year.

SUMMER SCHOLARSHIPS:
INTERNATIONAL SEMINARS -- ST. ALBANS SCHOOL

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

St. Albans School, a private educational institution in Washington, D.C., has conducted summer seminars in international affairs for high school students for five years. In the summer of 1967, scholarships for this program were made available, through funds from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, to 32 high school students in Title I public schools in the District of Columbia.

The International Seminars Program was in session from June 19 to July 21, 1967. This was a program in elementary international studies, the purpose of which was to bring students not only the historical background of African, Asian, and Latin American problems, but also the specialized knowledge on these areas which was available in Washington, D.C. By opening the program to qualified inner-city children, it was hoped that the program would stimulate their interest in international affairs and contribute to their all-around development as future leaders. One of the advantages of the program was its heterogeneous student body.

Courses were conducted by leading experts in the field, and in African Studies included Introduction to the History of Africa, Contemporary Africa, Introduction to Swahili, and Discussion Seminars on Africa.

In Asian Studies the following courses were offered: Introduction to East Asian History, South East Asia, Seminar on Contemporary Problems, and Introductory Chinese.

The Latin American Studies included: Introduction to the History of Latin America, Seminar on Contemporary Problems of Latin America, and Conversational Portuguese.

Courses of study were supplemented with numerous guest speakers and field trips. Among the speakers addressing the seminar were the former Ambassador of the Ivory Coast, representatives from the Embassies of Sierra Leone and Liberia, faculty members of The Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, American University and the University of Maryland, and representatives from the Agency for International Development. Typical field trips were those to the Embassies of Malagasy and Tanzania and to the Museum of African Art.

St. Albans School granted one college entrance credit for three courses successfully completed in the International Seminars.

STAFF

The faculty of the International Seminars was made up of men and women with extensive experience in the field of international studies. The staff consisted of:

1 Director
7 teachers
1 secretary

PARTICIPANTS

There were 61 high school students enrolled in the 1967 summer program, 33 girls and 28 boys. Of this group, 32 students came from District of Columbia Title I schools, all of whom received full scholarship aid. The remaining 29 students, most of whom received at least partial scholarship aid, came from a wide variety of Washington, Maryland, and Virginia public, private, and parochial schools.

Students generally were recommended by their counselors and history teachers. When possible, interviews were conducted with the students during the regular school year by the staff of the seminar.

PROBLEMS

There were no major problems except irregular attendance on the part of 5 to 10% of the students. The rationale of the faculty of the St. Albans School was to rely on the student's interests for regular attendance rather than pressure, so the faculty simply reported bad attendance in the final remarks returned to the regular schools.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$4,493
Enrollment:	32
Cost per pupil:	$140.50

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Title I students continue to participate in this program. The administration at St. Albans School plans to increase the total enrollment in next summer's program, with a proportional increase in the number of qualified students from Title I schools.

SUMMER SCHOLARSHIPS: THE HEIGHTS STUDY CAMP

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The Heights School, a private school in Washington, D.C., conducted a six-week study camp program for 37 boys entering the eighth or ninth grades in schools in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. Scholarships to attend this study camp were awarded to three junior high school boys from Title I public schools in the District of Columbia.

The Heights Study Camp was designed to offer pre-high school students a new and comprehensive approach to the fundamentals of good study habits, effective writing, and mathematical conceptualization, as well as to encourage and develop athletic potential.

The five-day week-program was structured so as to provide, each week, three half days of study, three half days of sports, one full day of sports, and one full day devoted to an excursion -- educational, recreational, or a combination of both.

The academic portion of the program placed primary emphasis on writing, study methods, and mathematics. Additional time was devoted to photography, speech, or drama, whichever was selected by the student.

Study Methods. Even the brightest students often go into high school with only the haziest notion of how to read, take notes, concentrate, organize time, and use a library. The students in the summer camp were given special training in these study methods.

Writing and Speaking. A primary objective of the Heights Study Camp was to teach the boys to read with comprehension, and to express themselves well both verbally and in writing. Small groups of eight or nine boys had writing classes each week followed by a 40-minute work period during which they applied the principles discussed in class. The speech program paralleled the composition-writing program.

Mathematics. The objective was to keep boys from getting rusty in their mathematics and to give them a good head start in high school algebra.

Sports. The program offered in athletics included baseball, basketball, volleyball, football, soccer, tennis, and swimming.

STAFF

The staff consisted of the following:

1 Program director
3 Full-time teachers
1 Athletic director
2 Full-time counselors
1 Part-time counselor
1 Photography teacher

There was no formal training for the staff, but the objectives of the program, curriculum design, etc., were outlined in staff meetings prior to and during the six-week program.

PARTICIPANTS

There were 37 students (all boys) who attended this summer program. All the students were entering the eighth and ninth grades, except one boy entering tenth grade. The students came from public and private schools in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. Two boys were from foreign countries. Three boys attended from target-area schools in the District of Columbia.

PROBLEMS

The biggest problems were transportation and the use of athletic facilities. The transportation problem was solved by obtaining the use of station wagons. In future programs, it is hoped there will be a bus available for the duration of the program.

The athletic facility problem was solved when St. John's College High School made available their fields and showers.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$90
Enrollment:	3
Cost per pupil:	$30

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Director of the program made the following recommendations for future programs:

1. Obtain a bus for the entire program.
2. Devote more time to classes.
3. Be more highly selective in choosing the boys to attend.

SUMMER SCHOLARSHIPS:
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGES AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

This program was designed to teach English as a foreign language to non-English-speaking children, who would eventually be assimilated into regular English-speaking classes. Essentially a pilot project, the program was based on the experiences of a similar program conducted in the summer of 1966, while expanding experimentation by the use of various books and methods. The program in the summer of 1966 was a ten-week program directed by an assistant in the Georgetown University School of Languages and Linguistics. The director of the program and one full-time teacher were paid, while a number of other teachers were student volunteers, aided by the parents of the children.

The eight-week summer program in 1967, financed by Title I and work-study grants, was staffed by teachers with professional linguistic background or elementary education training. Teachers were also assisted by part-time volunteers who helped with individual or small-group tutoring of the students.

Students were placed in sections according to both age and length of time in the United States. There were six classes, including a range of approximately four different levels. Classes were held in the Poulton Building near the Georgetown University campus from 9 to 12 noon, Monday through Friday. The daily schedule was made up of three classes - two hours of classwork and 30-45 minutes in the language laboratory, plus a short break. The older children had one teacher for one of their classes and their lab, and another teacher for their other class. The younger classes had one teacher for all three periods.

Classes included training in listening and speaking, and, in the later weeks of the program, some reading and writing for the lowest level. At the middle levels, some dialogue memorization, reading, and grammar were included. Most of the time at this level was devoted to grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and writing, with some time spent on lab work such as dictation from tapes and listening to speeches and short stories. It was found that, although the students appeared fairly fluent in speaking, they were very weak in written language. In general, however, all levels required tape work on such things as sounds and sound contrasts, common expressions, dialogues, and pattern practice drills and substitutions.

In addition to training in the written and spoken language, excursions were taken for further cultural orientation. Students in the program were taken to the National Zoo, a model farm, the "Santa Maria," and on a tour of Washington. The students also saw a film entitled "Learning English Early," which showed elementary school children in California learning English as a foreign language. The film demonstrated effective handling of the language problem of the many foreign children in the big city schools.

The enrollment in this summer program was one and a half times the number of students originally planned. In order to have taken care of all the children who needed this type of instruction, the school would have to have been twice as large.

This pilot project demonstrated the need for a year-round program in the District of Columbia Schools for teaching English to children whose native language is other than English.

STAFF

On the staff were:

1 administrator and teacher
5 teachers
2 regular part-time volunteers
10 part-time helpers from the Georgetown University Summer School and other Washington area students

Five of the teachers were selected from the students in the School of Languages and Linguistics of Georgetown University in order to have teachers who were trained in the teaching of English as a foreign language and to have teachers who would qualify under the Federal Work-Study Program (i.e., 90% of whose salary would be paid by Federal Work-Study funds allotted to Georgetown University and 10% by the Title I grant). Actually, the first requirement was more important, as the salary of the director and one teacher who did not qualify for the Work-Study grant was paid totally by the Title I grant. Three of the Georgetown students were under the Work-Study program. The sixth teacher, an elementary education major, was chosen because of her experience in last summer's program and her background in elementary education.

PARTICIPANTS

This program was for the non-English-speaking students, mainly Spanish-speaking, in the Cardozo Title I area. One student came from Bancroft Elementary School and all the others came from Sacred Heart and H. D. Cooke schools.

In all, 93 students participated in the program, 10 of whom were present for less than half of the program. Of the students who participated for at least half the program, 43 were boys and 40 were girls, ranging in age from 5 to 14 years. Students were selected on the recommendation of their schools.

PROBLEMS

The administrator and teachers in the program reported the following problems:

1. Proper placement of the students according to capabilities was a major problem in the beginning of the program. It took considerable shifting to get students placed in the proper classes as many needed help to different degrees in the four basic English skills of speaking, reading, writing, and spelling.

2. Insufficient staff. As the enrollment was greater than anticipated, there were 17 students in some of the classes instead of the original plan of 8 to 10. To alleviate the need for more teachers in order to give more individual attention to the students, each of whom was actually at a different level, volunteers were recruited from the summer school staff of Georgetown University.

3. Inability to order textbooks in advance. The staff was unable to order all the books in advance because they did not know the exact needs and abilities of the students. This problem was remedied by borrowing teacher's manuals and readers from Georgetown University and mimeographing this material until the books arrived.

4. Non-air conditioned classrooms. To alleviate this, teachers were able to hold some of the smaller classes in an air-conditioned office. Only the lowest and youngest level needed a large classroom.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$6,975
Enrollment:	93
Cost per pupil:	$75

RECOMMENDATIONS

If this program is held in the future, it is recommended by the administrator that efforts be made to provide for the following:

1. That the administrator teach only one hour per day. This year, the administrator taught the entire three hours and found certain administrative duties (meeting visitors and observers, taking care of sick children, etc.) took away class time. The administrator should be free to devote more time to administrative duties during and after classes, helping other teachers with materials, tapes, etc., and taking care of office procedures and emergencies during school. One suggestion would be that the administrator teach one hour and help proctor language lab periods during the other two periods.

2. That parents volunteer. Last year, chartered bus transportation was not provided, and some parents brought their children themselves and stayed for the time of the classes, both sitting in on the classes and helping in the monitoring of the language lab. There proved to be fewer discipline problems when the parents were in the room with the students.

3. Formal pretesting to facilitate better and earlier sectioning of students. Use of the "Diagnostic Test for Students of English as a Second Language" by Dr. A. L. Davis is recommended for the testing of written English (at least for middle- and upper-level students and older children).

4. More volunteers and staff in order to provide even smaller classes, especially for beginners, who need almost a 1 to 1 teacher-pupil ratio to keep up their interest and motivation.

SUMMER OCCUPATIONAL ORIENTATION

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

During the summer of 1967 the vocational schools became actively involved in the summer program financed by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The Summer Occupational Orientation program was a pilot program designed to provide an overall view of the world of work to high school students. It had been felt by the administration that the inner-city child has a very limited knowledge of the types of jobs available, the requirements, training, and employment possibilities. The students spent a large portion of the six-week session learning these things.

Three vocational schools offered their shops for use in the program: Bell, M. M. Washington, and Chamberlain. Six subjects were offered at each school, which included:

advertising art
auto repair
barbering
clerk-typist
cosmetology
drafting
electrical appliance repair
food preparation & service
health occupations
machine shop
photography
plumbing
printing (letter press & offset)
retailing
sewing
upholstery

This was a six-week program, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. Each student spent one week in each of the six shops in his school. In addition, he spent one hour each day receiving occupational information and job conditioning, taught by school counselors. The objectives of the counseling sessions were: (1) to provide experiences which would motivate the student to finish school, (2) to give information which would make the transition from school to work easier, and (3) to provide the student with incentives to help himself.

The other part of this summer program was part-time employment. There were to have been afternoon jobs for the students. The administrator reported, however, that the government agencies which had promised the jobs could not provide them in sufficient numbers to satisfy the needs of the program. Arrangements were then made with the Public School Work Scholarship Coordinator for job placements for the students.

STAFF

In addition to the administrator, the staff included:

1 program supervisor
3 coordinators (1 for each building)
9 counselors (3 for each building)
18 teachers (6 for each building)

The program supervisor had many years of experience as a job placement coordinator in her day school vocational program. The coordinators were selected with the following factors in mind: (1) familiarity with the building to be served, (2) a thorough background in vocational education, and (3) evidence of administrative and leadership abilities. The counselors were selected from the regular junior and senior high counseling and guidance personnel. The teachers were selected from the vocational school staffs and were usually located in their regular schools.

Workshops were held with three different groups: (1) coordinators - led by the administrator, (2) counselors - led by the administrator, the program supervisor, and the head of the Department of Guidance and Counseling, and (3) teachers - led by the administrator, the program supervisor, and the coordinators. There were also numerous planning sessions held by the administrator, the program supervisor, and the coordinators.

PARTICIPANTS

Application forms for enrollment were sent to all junior and senior high school students in grades 9 through 12. There were no requirements other than grade, and students were accepted as their applications were received. A waiting list was maintained in order that vacancies might be filled. There were 279 students enrolled, 50% of whom came from Title I target-area schools.

PROBLEMS

This was one of the few programs which was not beset by a multitude of mechanical problems. Other than the difficulty with job placement (explained above), the summer program went quite smoothly.

The student reaction to the program was varied. Many of them came expecting to have only one shop course; others came expecting only to be given jobs. Many of them became interested in other shops after having been introduced to them. The problem of delayed job placement also caused discontent among the students. Generally speaking, however, the program was well received by students and teachers.

COST PER PUPIL

Funds allotted: $27,962
Enrollment: 279
Cost per pupil: $100

RECOMMENDATIONS

This program seemed to have been a successful one. It made use of the equipment and space in the vocational schools as well as teachers therefrom. Also, it exposed inner-city students to the world of work.

Arrangements should be made well ahead of time for job placements, but where this is not possible then the students should be told what the probability is for obtaining jobs.

A similar program should be operated for junior high school students, but without the offer of a half-day job placement.

More emphasis should be placed upon enrolling students from target-area schools, particularly those students identified as potential dropouts.

PUPIL PERSONNEL TITLE I TEAM

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The target population for whom all Title I programs are designed were the "identified" students - identified as potential dropouts by their principals, teachers, and counselors in their own school. The purpose of the Pupil Personnel Title I Team was specifically to give special assistance to these children.

There were 34 Pupil Personnel Worker-Aide Teams, each consisting of a Pupil Personnel Worker and a Pupil Personnel Aide. There were also 5 Clinical Teams, each consisting of a clinical psychologist, a school psychologist, a psychiatric social worker, and a school attendance officer, where available.

Five regional centers were established in communities served by schools in the target area to house a basic team, including one of the Clinical Teams. The staff in each center varied with the availability of people to fill the positions.

The Pupil Personnel Worker-Aide Teams were the "grass-roots neighborhood educational workers." These teams carried out their activities with identified students under the supervision of Pupil Personnel Supervisory Staff and were always in direct contact with the principals of schools in the target area.

The Clinical Teams, being composed of more technically trained professional workers, concentrated on the more difficult cases. Referrals to the Clinical Teams came primarily from the Pupil Personnel Worker-Aide Teams but also from school principals and staff. These team members were in constant touch with facilities and agencies in the community that might be of assistance to the identified students.

The activities carried out by the teams differed somewhat from case to case. In general, the goal of the teams was to do whatever was necessary to help alleviate the problems of the child identified as a potential dropout.

The main thrust of the summer activities was to provide continuing contact with identified students, their parents, and the school, and to assist as much as possible through supporting agencies by referral or intervention and follow-up. By working with school personnel the teams attempted to involve every identified student in an appropriate summer program. This entailed direct home involvement in order to seek support for motivation, to facilitate enrollment, and to encourage continuing participation during the summer.

PARTICIPANTS

Originally there were 24,049 students identified by their principals, teachers, and counselors as potential dropouts. Of these, 2,197 had moved outside the target area and 4,415 were no longer enrolled in D.C. schools. The participants during the summer of 1967 were the 17,437 identified students who remained in the target-area schools.

The check made by the Pupil Personnel Worker-Aide Teams reveals that these identified students attended programs in the summer as follows:

Title I Summer Programs	
Primary Summer School	4827
Morning Physical Fitness	773
Enrichment Summer	2189
Vocational Orientation	178
Social Adjustment	299
Theater Workshops	17
15-12	47
Summer Camping	902
	9232

Other Summer Programs	
Regular Summer School	2896
Art Studio Center	68
13.7 Reading	1984
Future for Jimmy	264
Upward Bound	43
National Science Foundation	8
Various Community Programs (such as Vacation Bible School, Settlement House, or Block Program)	2454
Summer Youth Employment	594
	8311

Total identified students attending summer programs, as reported by Pupil Personnel Worker-Aide Teams: 9232 + 8311 = 17,543

It should be noted that the above figures were obtained from the records of the Pupil Personnel Worker-Aide Teams and may not agree with other participation records because of such things as overlap of programs.

PROBLEMS

The greatest problem that the Pupil Personnel Worker-Aide Teams had was caused by the late funding of the summer school. Once funding was approved, the Teams worked round the clock to make the necessary arrangements for placement of all identified students in summer programs which would be most beneficial to them.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$43,188
Enrollment:	17,437
Cost per pupil:	$2.50

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Strengthen this program where possible by keeping vacancies filled both in the Worker-Aide Teams and in the Clinical Teams.

2. Continue to assist the work of this group by better communication efforts with principals, school staff, and community agencies. Some sort of a monthly newsletter might be appropriate.

3. Include representatives of the Teams in any planning group for future programs. This would allow the planning group to utilize the Teams' knowledge of the needs and characteristics of the identified students, and also permit the Teams to obtain up-to-the-minute information on planned programs which would greatly assist them in the placement of identified students in programs which would be most beneficial to them.

PRIMARY SUMMER SCHOOL

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The Primary Summer School was continued as a Title I program for the third year. The six-week summer program was a combination of reading readiness, language arts, and language and cultural enrichment. The objectives of the program are still the same as in previous years:

1. to develop an interest in and a liking for reading;
2. to create a friendly, relaxed environment for learning;
3. to build each child's self-confidence so that he is willing to learn;
4. to develop word attack skills through a strong phonetic program; and
5. to provide meaningful experiences on which to base reading and language growth.

Many of the teachers became quite inventive in their classrooms. They developed experience charts and rebus charts, conducted field trips, and used games to develop a unified summer approach for the children. The teachers attempted to provide the richest experiences possible.

There was no set routine for the classes, but the day followed a general pattern:

9:00 - 9:20	opening
9:20 - 9:40	phonovisual work, games
9:40 - 10:00	reading readiness (or similar activity)
10:00 - 10:20	seat work coordinated with readiness activity
10:20 - 10:45	lavatory and outside play
10:45 - 11:00	rest period
11:00 - 11:20	working with numbers or literature
11:20 - 11:50	art activity

Since the children were at different levels of experience and readiness, the teachers developed various methods of teaching their classes. The following is an excerpt from a report of one of the teachers:

> "The only way for a teacher to reach any objective, under these circumstances, is to abandon all preconceived ideas of what should be taught and teach what needs to be taught! I tried to approach these subjects from every possible angle, in as interesting and varied a manner as I knew how - AND BELIEVE ME, I WAS WORN OUT AT 12:30!"

In addition to the regular classwork, the children took field trips as part of the enrichment program. The highlight of the six-week session was attending two plays at the Arena Stage: "Treasure Island" and "The Hither and Thither of Danny Dither."

The opinion of an overwhelming number of teachers was that this program contributed greatly toward cultural enrichment and in strengthening reading and other communication skills. Many teachers also felt that the program strengthened student motivation toward school.

STAFF

The program had a director and one coordinator. There were 131 regular primary teachers assigned to classrooms in addition to special teachers who visited several rooms. At the beginning of the program, the director and the coordinator had an orientation for the teachers, which included the following:

1. explanation of the Bank Street readers, by the assistant director of the Reading Clinic;
2. the importance of teacher creativity, by the director;
3. introduction of materials;
4. discussion of the plays at the Arena Stage, by a language arts teacher; and
5. demonstration of handwriting instruction, by an experienced handwriting teacher.

Due to the number of teachers involved in this program, the orientation was held on two separate days.

PARTICIPANTS

Children were selected according to the following criteria:

1. All children who did not have kindergarten experience but were entering first grade in September, including all children then on the kindergarten waiting lists;
2. Children who were promoted in June from kindergarten to junior primary; and
3. Junior primary, first, and second grade pupils.

There were 4953 children enrolled in the program. They were not restricted to Title I schools or to identified students.

PROBLEMS

The most pressing and urgent problem was the unavailability of supplies. This was the third year in which the teachers in the program had to adjust their plans to work without proper supplies at the beginning of the program. Some teachers borrowed supplies from the building, some brought their own, and some simply did without.

The second most serious problem was the teacher assignments. In far too many instances teachers received their notices of appointments and their building assignments at the last moment. Even after the session began, teachers and children were shifted from one building or class to another.

Teacher-aides were used this past summer, but many of them did not have enough experience to be of any real value in the classroom. It would seem that more effective use of classroom aides would contribute substantially to the success of this or any program.

COST PER PUPIL

Funds allotted:	$408,401
Enrollment:	4953
Cost per pupil:	$82.50

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for changes or improvements in the program were taken from questionnaires filled out by teachers who took part in the program:

1. A clearer statement of objectives and better planning and organization prior to the summer program are needed. Sufficient materials and supplies in adequate variety should be available at the start of the program.

2. Resource teachers (art, music, physical fitness instruction, etc.) are needed in greater numbers.

3. Many teachers thought trips should be planned before the summer program began, wanted more of them, and thought the principal should have more authority over the buses.

4. Tape recorders supplied to the teachers would enable the children to help themselves in improving their speech patterns, which they would recognize more easily if their speech were played back to them. This would also help them with developing ability for oral expression.

5. Parent participation in such programs as art or music should be encouraged more.

THEATER WORKSHOPS

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The Theater Workshops was a six-week summer program for elementary and secondary students conducted by professionals from the Arena Stage Theater. The program was designed to introduce inner-city children to the area of drama, with emphasis on both the technical and performing aspects of the theater.

Cultural enrichment is often limited for children from low-income families and they do not have the opportunity to go beyond their disadvantaged environment. This program provided an opportunity for children to express themselves outside their environment. The child player has the feeling of an individual and that what he says is important. The child also delights in sharing ideas with others in a common project.

Students in the workshops were introduced to the elements of acting through improvisational theater games and exercises. Technical aspects of theater production were also studied. Children had the opportunity to observe both the acting and the production elements of the theater when they attended three professional productions at the Arena Stage Theater.

Workshops were held at Terrell and Jefferson Junior High Schools.

STAFF

The program was conducted by a director from the Arena Stage Theater and two actresses who served as assistants. The actresses were given a two-week training period in the concepts of teaching and working with children.

PARTICIPANTS

Teachers and counselors recommended children who were interested in the program. There were 54 children enrolled in the Theater Workshops Program; 30 were elementary school children and 24 were junior high school students. Of the total group, 17 were identified students in Title I schools.

PROBLEMS

The director of the program felt that the most severe problem was the lack of air-conditioned space in which to conduct the classes. He found the heat affected the attention span of the children and the general effectiveness of the program.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds: $12,000
Enrollment: 54
Cost per pupil: $222

RECOMMENDATIONS

Future programs should have more adequate facilities provided, and a more comprehensive plan of action prepared beforehand. They should also be organized to serve a larger number of students, and an effort made to reduce the cost per pupil.

GEORGETOWN COLLEGE ORIENTATION PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The Georgetown College Orientation Program was begun in 1964 under the sponsorship of Georgetown University and the National Science Foundation. In 1966 the District of Columbia School System assumed part of the budget with funds from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The program was designed for high school students who possess the intellectual capacity for college work and have demonstrated an interest in college, but who are not likely to gain admission to a suitable college. The specific objectives are:

1. to change the student's attitudes toward academic subjects
2. to restore the student's confidence in himself in dealing with these subjects
3. to motivate the student to go on to college

For two eight-week sessions the students attended classes in English, reading, mathematics, biology, and chemistry. In order to prepare these students for college entrance and later success, teachers used the most dynamic methods and materials at their command. In the science courses students were given laboratory experiences with commonplace items such as ink, soap, and aspirin. In math no textbook was used; students were given large notebooks in which to write course content and examples. The English classes used such reading material as To Sir with Love and Death of a Salesman instead of the usual selections from Dickens, Shakespeare, as was possible during a summer program.

Students also received counseling as part of the summer session. Much of the assistance was in selecting colleges, preparing for college board exams, filling out applications for admission, and applying for financial aid. The students also attended plays, games, and open-air concerts. The teachers felt that this program helped to strengthen student motivation for school, minimize feelings of hostility and alienation, establish more appropriate patterns of student aspirations, provide cultural enrichment, strengthen subject matter, and instill pride and self-confidence.

STAFF

The staff consisted of the following personnel:

1 director
1 assistant director
1 senior counselor
18 teachers (English, chemistry, biology, and math)
2 reading specialists
4 tutor-counselors

The director was an assistant professor of English at Georgetown University and his assistant, the principal of McKinley High School. The senior counselor and eleven of the instructors are members of the teaching staff at Georgetown. One instructor was a Ph.D. candidate at Howard University and six other instructors were Ph.D. candidates at Georgetown. The two reading specialists were members of the Georgetown Psychological Services Bureau. The program also employed four college students as tutor-counselors; three of these students were graduates of the College Orientation Program.

Faculty members convened regularly throughout the program. The tutor-counselors were given a week of orientation before the program began, and the director and senior counselor also held weekly meetings with them.

PARTICIPANTS

The students in the program were selected from names recommended by the high school counselors. Counselors made their recommendations based upon the following criteria:

1. academic placement in the second or third track in school
2. a grade range between low B and D
3. some demonstration of college potential
4. indication of an interest in attending college

The other requirement for admission into the program was financial qualification for Title I assistance. Parental permission was necessary for participation, also. The students came from Cardozo, Dunbar, Eastern, McKinley, and Spingarn High Schools. There were 23 boys and 14 girls in the 11th grade and 6 boys and 9 girls in the 10th grade.

PROBLEMS

One of the major problems here was the diverse academic backgrounds of the participants. This was particularly true in the mathematics courses where some students had taken one course, some two courses, and some three. The students were grouped within the class according to experience level, and students who needed remedial work were assisted by the tutor-counselors. The problem of student motivation was handled individually by the director along with the parents.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds: $30,000
Enrollment: 52
Cost per pupil: $577

RECOMMENDATIONS:

This was the most expensive of all the Title I 1967 summer programs and far exceeded the average per-pupil cost of $100 of the 1966 summer programs. Efforts should be made to reduce the costs either by increasing the number of students and/or reducing overall expenses.

While it is certainly desirable that efforts be made to encourage under-achievers with college potential who might also be identified students, we have no knowledge of how effective the program has been. It is recommended that a follow-up be made of previous students who attended this program.

SECONDARY SCHOOL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

This six-week summer program offered to junior and senior high school students noncredit enrichment courses in areas such as home economics, industrial arts, typing, music, art, mathematics, chemistry, foreign languages, science, and physical education. These courses were held at schools where a regular summer school was in operation. Funds from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided additional staff, faculty, materials, and supplies for the enrichment classes.

In the summer of 1967 enrichment classes were conducted at Douglass, Miller, Pabaut, Eliot (classes held at Eastern High School), and Banneker Junior High Schools, and at Cardozo, Spingarn, and Eastern High Schools.

Typical of enrichment classes offered was the program presented to students at Miller Junior High School. The administrator of this program made the following comments:

> "From observation there was growth in each group. The groups were arts and crafts, music, electricity, woodwork shop, foods, and clothing. One could hear the single notes from the music room during the first week; as time went on the melody of an orchestra. From single stitching to the complete garment was evident in the clothing class. Arts and crafts produced lamps of beauty; the electricity class taught useful household information; the woodwork classes produced finished products for the home. In all, time well spent with efficient teachers."

STAFF

Most of the teachers were from the regular school system of the District of Columbia Public Schools. They were assisted, in some instances, by volunteers from the Peace Corps who were preparing to teach in Sierre Leone, West Africa. Most of the Peace Corps group were recent college graduates but with little or no teaching experience. The regular teacher acted as a master teacher and aided the Peace Corps trainee in preparing lesson plans and in the presentation of the lesson. The Peace Corps trainees, in turn, brought to the class a freshness of approach and a diversity of personality.

PARTICIPANTS

There were 782 pupils enrolled in this program. This was less than the anticipated enrollment, probably due to the fact that the decision to offer this summer program came shortly before the end of the regular school year, so there was very little time to inform students about the program. In some instances, teachers assigned to this program recruited students for their classes. Students were not grouped by age or grade, so that many classes were very heterogeneous.

Senior high school students did not respond as well as junior high school students, as many of the older boys and girls were seeking summer jobs.

Attendance was voluntary, with the understanding that students should not be absent more than two consecutive days. A review of questionnaires completed by teachers in this program indicates that the attendance of the students was excellent, that there were very few disciplinary problems, and that the students were eager and cooperative.

PROBLEMS

This program had serious problems, most of which stemmed from the late decision to offer the program. This late decision prevented proper publicity about the program to the students and their parents and thus prevented proper recruitment. The late decision delayed the ordering of supplies, which affected all the programs but was especially disastrous to the art and sewing courses; also the late decision prevented proper program planning. Teachers expressed the need for an orientation period and the establishment of better guidelines for the program. In many instances, funds should be available for field trips where they are an integral part of the program.

Despite these problems, questionnaires from the teachers and students indicated that many worthwhile experiences did result. Many of the students indicated a desire to attend similar classes the next summer. Teachers almost unanimously agreed that the more relaxed and informal atmosphere of the summer noncredit classes produced a more favorable attitude toward school on the part of the students, and that they found the summer program challenging.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$25,572
Enrollment:	782
Cost per pupil:	$32.50

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that, if and when this program is held in the future, efforts be made to provide for the following:

1. More publicity about the program in advance of the beginning date.

2. Supplies and manuals be obtained and equipment be repaired in advance of the program.

MORNING PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The Summer Physical Fitness Program was an extension of the Early Morning Breakfast and Physical Fitness Project which operates during the regular school year. This was the third summer for this program. Poor health has a direct, adverse effect upon student performance, so any program which improves physical health enhances the student's ability to succeed in school.

The students met Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. from June 26 through August 4. The schedule included vigorous exercises, interpretive rhythmic activities, organized games, field trips, and swimming. Students were taught that physical fitness was achieved through a sensible balance of these activities, adapted to age, maturity, and physical capability. The National Achievement Test in Physical Fitness was administered in seven areas during the first and fifth weeks of the program. Percentile ratings were established based upon the performance scores, and at the end of the six weeks those students who equalled or surpassed certain standards received awards. The awards ceremony along with field and track meets made up the closing exercises. The highlight of the entire session was a three-day camping trip for many of the boys in the program.

STAFF

The staff consisted of the following:

1	coordinator
1	assistant coordinator
5	center directors
22	teachers
18	teacher-aides
10	custodial helpers

The coordinator, directors, and most of the teachers had been involved in the program during previous summers. The aides and helpers were college students employed for the summer.

The staff felt that the program contributed significantly to improving physical health, instilling pride and self-confidence, providing cultural enrichment, improving mental health, and minimizing feelings of hostility.

PARTICIPANTS

The majority of the students were from target-area schools. They were selected from referrals by Pupil Personnel Services; recommendations by counselors, teachers, and principals; and requests from students and parents. The program involved 663 boys and 284 girls, representing grades 1-9.

PROBLEMS

The most frequently cited problem in the program was the late announcement that Summer Physical Fitness would be held. As was the situation with many other summer programs, many of the students who would have attended had already made other plans.

The other major problem was organization which resulted in many conflicts in scheduling.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$34,803
Enrollment:	947
Cost per pupil:	$37

RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the recommendations for early announcement of summer programs and coordination of summer activities, it is suggested that the camping trips be expanded to include girls and that the camping program be coordinated with the camping schedules of the other summer projects.

SPECIAL ORIENTATION FOR SIXTH GRADERS

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The Special Orientation for Sixth Graders program was set up to facilitate the entry of elementary school graduates into junior high school. The objectives were threefold:

1. To give sixth-grade graduates an introduction to junior high procedures,

2. To provide instructional enrichment for these students in math, science, English, and social studies, and

3. To provide a practice teaching experience for Peace Corps trainees who were scheduled to go to Sierre Leone, Africa.

The program was located in six elementary schools: Birney, Davis, Gibbs, Park View, Petworth, and Shadd. Students followed a daily schedule, passing from one classroom to another as is done in the secondary schools. Each master teacher had trainees assigned to him for guidance and instruction. The master teacher taught the first period each day and was observed by the Peace Corpsmen. The trainee then taught the remaining periods under supervision. The thrust of the program may be seen in the stated methods of one master teacher:

> "Relative to students, objectives for both enrichment and remedial work were clearly focused on the discovery technique and inductive teaching, dispensing with rote learning and the teacher-lecture process. The main objective was to create a climate for learning whereby the child was motivated and encouraged to think, examine, and then arrive at a logical conclusion through his own discoveries. Relative to trainees, objectives were reached through observations of class taught by trainees, daily written evaluations and follow-up conferences, weekly ratings of trainees with written observations, and finally weekly meetings."

There was also a periodic rating sheet made out on each Peace Corps trainee.

STAFF

There were 24 regular classroom teachers in the program and approximately 70 Peace Corps trainees. The teachers were selected on recommendations from principals and supervisors. There was a three-day orientation for the teachers during which they became familiar with the structure of the Peace Corps training program, the type of school organization to be found in Sierre Leone, and their function as master teachers. The teachers themselves also held strategy sessions to make broad areas of study for each course.

PARTICIPANTS

The children were selected from the graduating classes of six elementary schools. The selections were made by the principals based on recommendations of the classroom teachers. These children were chosen because they were cooperative sixth graders who could profit from an extended learning experience. There were 335 children in the program, more than twice as many of them girls than boys. Thirty-one percent of the participants were from Title I target schools.

PROBLEMS

In this program, as in so many others, the most pressing problem was the lack of supplies, which had a very serious effect upon the success of the program. The small enrollment in the program was another shortcoming. Having too few students in a program can be just as unwise as having too many. As one teacher expressed it:

> "The challenge was to teach in a training program, attempting to present a realistic picture in a highly idealistic atmosphere (with only five students in class)."

Many teachers suggested that a waiting list of potential participants be maintained and that vacancies in the program be filled from that list as they occurred. As it was, teachers canvassed the neighborhoods and brought in more children.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$22,848
Enrollment:	335
Cost per pupil:	$68

RECOMMENDATIONS

If this program is to continue to be funded under Title I, efforts should be made to enroll more identified children from the target-area schools. One of the qualifications required for this program was "cooperativeness", and since uncooperativeness is a characteristic of many identified children, it is not surprising that the percentage of participants from target-area schools is low.

SUMMER CAMPING

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The 1967 camping program gave 902 children from Title I schools in the District of Columbia an opportunity to attend a two-week camping session in one of 12 residential camps in the Washington area. Contracts for the camping periods were made with various camping agencies, such as Camp Fire Girls, YMCA, Boy Scouts, Christ Child Settlement House, and similar organizations.

The objectives of the camping program were to encourage in inner-city children an appreciation for the outdoors; to provide an experience in group living, and an opportunity to live and play with children from other schools and economic circumstances; and to help them develop creativity.

Activities at the different camps varied, but generally included such things as nature lore, hiking, arts and crafts, swimming, boating, archery, horseback riding, athletic games, campfires, and singing.

STAFF

Since established residential camps were used, the staffs were usually of a professional and experienced level and met the standards set by the various camping associations.

Most camp directors conducted a pre-camp training orientation period for their staffs.

For some camp organizations, this was the first experience for the staff in working with children from inner-city, low-income families. In-service training was conducted which was specifically oriented to understanding the characteristics of these children. As a resource for this training, the staff at one camp found a U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication entitled "Good Camping for Children and Youth of Low-Income Families" by Catherine V. Richards, to be an excellent guide.

PARTICIPANTS

Children were selected by the Title I Worker-Aide Teams of the Pupil Personnel Department. Team members had the responsibility of securing parent permissions, obtaining needed camp clothing, scheduling and frequently escorting pupils for medical examinations, and transporting identified students to camp pickup stations. A total of 1,093 identified students were contacted for the camping program. Of that total number, 902 attended camp. The Summer Camping Program served a higher proportion of the needy children in the Washington area than did any other summer Title I Program.

The Worker-Aide Teams conducted a follow-up study of the camping program interviewing campers, parents, and teachers. Both parents and teachers tended to agree that the camping experience had a major impact on the lives of these identified students.

CAMP LIST AND ENROLLMENT FOR SUMMER, 1967

336 - Camp Goshen (Boy Scouts)
102 - Christ Child Camp (Christ Child Settlement House)
119 - Camp Mawavi (Camp Fire Girls)
131 - Camp Lichtman (YMCA)
26 - Camp Happyland (Salvation Army)
60 - Camp Winslow (Boys' Club of Greater Washington)
14 - Camp Friendship (Friendship Settlement House)
30 - Camp Letts
71 - Camp George
8 - Camp Orenda

902 TOTAL

PROBLEMS

Counselors stated that the most common problem was homesickness—many of the inner-city children had never been away from home before. The problem seemed to be resolved quicker in camps where seasoned campers from other schools were attending the same camp.

Another common problem involved group and individual discipline and control. Some children made poor adjustments to group living situations, such as constant bickering and fighting, lack of respect for peers, and resentment for authority. In a few instances, it was necessary to remove a child from the unit and place him with the director or nurse.

Securing adequate camp clothing and blankets and sheets was, in many instances, a severe problem.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds: $53,230
Enrollment: 902
Cost per pupil: $59

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made for the planning of a future summer camping program:

1. Plans for the program should be made as far in advance as possible. Plans for the 1967 camping sessions were finalized shortly before the date the first session of the camps was to open. Without the round-the-clock endeavors of the Pupil Personnel Department, it would not have been possible to select the children and carry out the many necessary details. Early planning would also be a valuable asset to the camper, the family, and the camp staff.

2. It was originally planned that the children from Title I schools would attend camp with children from other schools and economic circumstances. Because of the late funding of this program, this was not always possible. Most of the directors recommend that, in the future, the program be so planned that children from Title I schools attend camping sessions with children from other schools and with children who have had previous camping experience. Seasoned campers can do much to help inner-city children adjust to camp life and group living.

3. Adequate clothing and bedding should be secured well in advance of the beginning of the program. Since these children are from low-income families, they often could not afford to purchase clothing and bedding. This problem might be resolved by establishing a fund for purchase of clothing and bedding out of the total allocated camping budget. The purchases could be made in quantities and at wholesale prices.

4. Camp directors almost unanimously agreed that working with children from low-income families necessitates a lower counselor-camper ratio than would otherwise be necessary in a camping situation. They therefore recommended that the camp staff be increased. Camp directors also agreed that it would be helpful to secure the services of one or two staff members with special training in helping children with problems of social adjustment (perhaps members of the Pupil Personnel Services Teams).

5. The children should have a more thorough medical examination before arriving at camp (impetigo on the neck of one camper caused 20 girls to break out in a rash).

6. If there is a canteen in the camp, the Title I children should be provided with a small allowance per week so they do not feel left out of this part of the camp activities.

7. Many camp directors commented that two-week camp sessions for these children who had no previous camping experience was very unsatisfactory - it took them a full week to adjust to camp life, and they were just beginning to get some value from the program when it was time to return home. A third week would allow a much better adjustment to camp life, and it is entirely possible that a third week would double the benefits of the camping experience.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

This six-week summer program provided instrumental music instruction as a continuation of the regular music program of the District of Columbia Youth Symphony. Six years ago the District of Columbia Youth Symphony program was begun and now has in the regular school year 15 teachers, beginning and intermediate classes, a string chamber orchestra, a junior high school and senior high school band, and a string quartet, in addition to the full symphony orchestra. Young people enrolled in the program come from 70 elementary and junior and senior high schools.

The District of Columbia Youth Symphony has made an important cultural contribution to Washington. It has provided the opportunity for instrumental training and playing for young people of all ages; it has provided the opportunity for more than 20,000 public school children to attend performances of live orchestra; it has evoked family participation and given a new musical experience to the whole community.

Classes were held at Coolidge Senior High School from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. Students attended from 150 schools from all areas of the city (public, private, and parochial schools). The students provided their own transportation. Instrumental instruction, both beginning and advanced, was offered in all band and orchestra instruments, plus theory classes in ear training, scales, intervals, melody, and music history. All classes used a method book which covered all instruments. The staff tried to establish an even level of development for band and orchestra. The theory class was a great help in exposing students to a knowledge of music they did not get in instrumental instruction which helped them to understand the need for scales and ear training. Many students were able to strengthen their school bands and orchestras when they returned to their regular schools and some became leaders.

Parents and friends were invited to attend a concert given by the summer school students on 2 August 1967 to demonstrate the achievements of the program.

Despite problems such as securing instruments (they had to be borrowed from the regular schools) and large class size, the program was a success. Comments from questionnaires completed by the teachers indicate their enthusiasm, and the eagerness and diligence of the students. Excerpts from the teachers' comments follow:

> "An interesting aspect of this program is the fact that students of various social, economic, and musical backgrounds are together for only a few weeks but mold into a musical unit quickly. Also, students who lived an hour's bus ride from the school made genuine efforts to be in attendance regularly and promptly."

"The challenge to me was to try to provide (in a six-week period) the fundamentals of music theory that each group, according to ability level, warranted. This was difficult with such a large enrollment and students reporting on an alternate basis. Five daily classes in a six-week period with consecutive **daily** practice produces better results."

"Despite the problem I was inspired by the students' (beginners to senior high) initiative to 'stick with it' and learn as much as they could in such a relatively brief period. The large enrollment also attested to an individual quest for cultural enrichment."

"The greatest challenge to me was developing such a conglomeration of students, many with seemingly rather dubious skills and ability, into a performing concert band in six weeks, a band that would be capable of giving (and would give) a performance of the quality befitting an all-city junior band, that being a quality much higher than the average junior high school band...There were literally no discipline problems of any significance to my knowledge, because the children knew that they were there to work and actually liked this aspect of the program. Absences were very low, and the kind of enthusiastic response that makes a child get out of bed and come to music school every day for six weeks of his summer, and come there to work, not to play, was very rewarding."

"Satisfying the children's thirst for knowledge was my greatest challenge. I have never had a class that has worked as hard, and in such a constructive manner, as this class. The greatest reward was the expressed desire of the class to continue this work in the winter program."

STAFF

There were 18 teachers on the staff, 15 instrumental and 3 theory. The staff were public school teachers, selected by the Director after he had observed their work in regular school sessions and their training of students in the Youth Orchestra. The Director felt that the staff was a very fine group of teachers who were interested in developing well-trained and disciplined students. One music teacher, in addition to the 18, was a volunteer and the office administrator for the program was also a volunteer.

Three orientation staff meetings were held with each group (i.e., string, woodwinds, and brass) prior to the opening of the program. Two faculty meetings were held each week for evaluation of the progress of the program and to make decisions on problems.

PARTICIPANTS

There were 530 students enrolled in this program -- 275 boys and 255 girls. The age of the students ranged from 6½ through 17.

Students were notified of the summer program through their school music teachers in June 1967 and registration notices were sent to all principals and supervisors. When the registration blanks were received, the students were called to determine their training and background, and this information was used to place them in a class.

All students who registered were accepted, except students who desired training on the guitar or the piano. The students were grouped according to ability and age.

Only 23% of the students enrolled in the program were from Title I target-area schools.

PROBLEMS

The necessary funds for this summer program were not released until two days prior to the summer recess. There was not enough time for adequate recruitment of students or for advance planning and organization of the program by the staff. Many students with music talent who would have been interested in attending the program had made other summer plans. Even then, the enrollment exceeded expectations and more teachers were needed. The ratio of teachers to students in some classes was as high as 70 to 1. Large classes prohibited small group instruction, which is essential to achieve the highest quality in teaching instrumental music. This was resolved somewhat by dividing the classes and having the students attend on alternate days.

Another problem was the securing of instruments, which had to be borrowed from the regular schools. The teachers were responsible for securing the instruments and, in some instances, it was difficult to get them before the program started.

The majority of the staff expressed the need for teacher-aides to help with the nonprofessional tasks.

COST PER PUPIL

Funds allotted:	$12,200
Enrollment:	530
Cost per pupil:	$23

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that efforts be made to provide for the following for future programs:

1. earlier availability of funds to permit proper planning and hiring;

2. more teachers to enable classes to be smaller;

3. make instruments available to students prior to the closing of the regular school session;

4. teacher-aides to help in the nonprofessional tasks, so that the teachers can spend more time in instruction;

5. a large concert at the close of the summer programs (**Ca**rter Barron or the Mall), which could give everyone an idea of the all-city efforts. This could be designated as National City or Washington Youth Recognition Day, or some other appropriate title.

6. As only a quarter of the students participating in this program were from Title I schools, perhaps only one-fourth of the expenses of the program should be borne by Title I funds.

VOCATIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The Vocational Orientation Program was a six-week summer program designed to acquaint students from grade 7 through 12 with one or two of the many industrial arts. The three centers involved in the program had one basic goal: to give the young people an opportunity to learn something about the vocational skills that are taught in the senior high and vocational schools. The classes offered were: electricity, arts and crafts, woodworking, clothing, foods, music, metalcraft, printing, and mathematics. Since many of the students had not decided upon a high school study course, this program helped them in making such a decision.

In order to accomplish the goal, one center provided each student with the opportunity to engage in concentrated shopwork, along with a mathematics course designed to supplement that work. Field trips were made so that the students might see the labor force in action.

Another center presented a program that enabled each student to make something or finish a task by the end of the six weeks. Students were encouraged to be independent and resourceful, and to be as creative as their talents would allow. They were also taught the necessity for caution, care, and consideration in using all equipment.

The program had a relaxed structure, allowing students to pursue interests rather than following a prescribed course of routine study.

STAFF

The number and type of teacher varied from one center to another. The staff for all three centers was as follows:

3	Center directors
11	Industrial arts teachers
9	Home economics teachers
4	Music teachers
1	Mathematics teacher
1	Counselor

Many of the summer school personnel were part of the staff in that school during the regular school year. This gave teachers access to equipment and materials which would otherwise have been unavailable.

PARTICIPANTS

Students came into the program voluntarily, and there were no entrance requirements. Since the enrollment quota was not reached from the grades 7-12 students, the original grade limits were not strictly adhered to -- one center enrolled a 4th grader, and another had three adults; the heaviest enrollment was from grades 7 and 8. There were 355 students in the program.

PROBLEMS

The fact that Vocational Orientation was announced at nearly the end of the school year made recruitment of staff and students quite difficult. By the time the announcement was made, many students had enrolled in other summer programs. The other serious problem faced by the staff was the lack of supplies. Some supplies which had been ordered on the second or third day of the program did not arrive until five weeks later.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$19,800
Enrollment:	355
Cost per pupil:	$56

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made by the Directors and the teachers, or by Project staff after direct observation of the program in operation:

1. Define the objectives of the Vocational Orientation Program prior to the start of the program both for the guidance of the administrators and staff and for use in future programs.

2. Coordinate this program with the Summer Occupational Orientation Program held in the vocational schools, as the objectives of the two programs are quite similar and probably draw from the same population.

3. Arrange for the materials, supplies, and facilities well ahead of the beginning of the summer program. In some cases, materials ordered did not arrive until the last week of the summer school.

JUNIOR HIGH SUMMER SCHOOL AND TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTE
(MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION)

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

Each summer the Model School Division has conducted an institute for the teachers within the Division. During the summer of 1967 the Junior High Summer School and Teacher Training Institute afforded approximately 40 teachers and others an opportunity to experiment with various techniques and devices employed in the Division. The adults participating in the institute were teachers, principals, supervisors, consultants, coordinators, and directors. They spent one half of each day in a classroom which exposed them to new and old units of social studies, mathematics, reading, science, and language arts.

Twelve of the teachers were to form a teaching core, which, with assistance from the National Training Laboratory, would help teachers in the Model School Division during the regular school year.

STAFF

The staff consisted of a director and five elementary school teachers. All the teachers on the staff had participated in the workshops of 1965 and 1966. In addition to the regular staff, resource people were brought in wherever appropriate.

PARTICIPANTS

The students who served as subjects for the institute were sent from grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 of Model School Division elementary schools on a quota basis. The elementary school principals were sent memos explaining the purpose of the school, along with forms for the teachers to use in selecting those children who would attend class regularly and benefit from the experience. The parents of those students selected also filled out forms for their children. There were 143 students in the program, 86 girls and 57 boys.

PROBLEMS

Because of the fact that this was the third year for the institute, there were no major problems.

COST PER PUPIL

Allotted funds:	$19,067
Enrollment:	143 students, 40 teachers
Cost per pupil:	(A cost per pupil is not appropriate for this program.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

The one recommendation for this program is that the workshop be for a period longer than 18 days. A longer period would allow the teachers a greater degree of participation and would allow more of the supervisory staff to participate in the program with the children.

While the primary purpose of this program is to afford teachers of identified students an opportunity to experiment with various techniques, materials, and equipment, it has been found that the children in the school benefit greatly. It would therefore be more appropriate if the children who attend this institute were all identified students.

V. ANALYSIS OF DATA

A. Student Evaluation Forms

One of the measuring instruments used to evaluate the summer programs was the Student Evaluation Form (SEF), a copy of which will be found in Appendix B. At the end of the programs, teachers or instructors used this questionnaire to rate the participants on 22 items related to the objectives or expected outcomes of the programs. Over 7,100 SEF's were received from 15 different programs (see Appendix A).

In order to obtain an indication of what proportion of the students came from the Title I target area, the school of origin of a sample of children in each program was tallied from the SEF's or program rosters. It was found that slightly more than 60% came from these schools. Table 2 shows the number of students in each program and the percentage of them coming from Title I schools. In some programs, such as Summer Camping and the Morning Physical Fitness, the percentage of such students was 100%.

In order to obtain a preliminary evaluation of the kinds of students in each program to compare with students in similar programs during the preceding summer, a hand tally was made of the teacher evaluations of the students in each program for SEF items 2 and 12. Item 2 is the teacher evaluation of academic achievement on a three-point scale: "How well does this pupil do in his school work?" Item 12 is the teacher evaluation of each student on a five-point scale: "Uncooperative--Cooperative."

Table 2 also shows means and standard deviations for these two items for programs for which the data are available. It will be seen that the mean score of the students varied significantly from program to program for both items 2 and 12. This is because the students were selected on different criteria for the various programs and therefore had different characteristics. Also, the teachers or instructors who evaluated the students were quite different in each program, because the summer school teachers were drawn from a wide variety of sources, such as nuns, shop teachers, music teachers, etc., many of whom were not regular academic classroom teachers.

A comparison was made between the programs which operated both in 1966 and in 1967. Table 3 shows the mean summer school teacher ratings for seven such programs. It should be emphasized that both the teachers and the students were different. The table shows that on item 2 students in four out of seven programs (Physical Fitness, Georgetown College Orientation, Social Adjustment, and Junior High College Prep--Gonzaga) rated higher in 1967 than in 1966. On item 12 only two programs (Physical Fitness and Enrichment Summer School) had higher mean scores in 1967 than in 1966. The rating of the students on "cooperativeness" was generally lower in 1967 than in 1966. This does not mean that the 1967 summer programs were not effective in achieving their

TABLE 2

1967 Summer Programs Showing Total Enrollment, Percentage from Title I Schools,
and Means and Standard Deviations for a Sample of Summer School Teacher Evaluations of Students in Each Program

Code	Name of Program	Students in Program N	% Title I Schools	Item 2* M	Item 2* S.D.	Item 2* Sample N	Item 12* M	Item 12* S.D.	Item 12* Sample N
410	Social Adjustment	327	60	2.190	.688	100	3.220	1.064	100
420	Webster School for Girls	53	67	2.250	.699	20	3.100	1.179	20
440	Joint Public & Parochial--15-12	175	76	2.280	.638	100	3.540	1.152	100
450	Jr. High College Prep (Gonzaga)	89	72	1.867	.587	75	3.507	.997	75
	Summer Scholarships:								
461	Sociology Seminar--Nat. Cathedral Sch.	9	100	**			**		
462	Internat'l Seminar--St. Albans School	32	100	**			**		
463	Study Camp--Heights School	3	100	**			**		
464	Language Institute--Georgetown Univ.	93	47	1.771	.734	83	3.795	1.062	83
470	Summer Occupational Orientation	279	50	2.010	.592	100	3.566	.829	99
500	Primary Summer School	4953	54	2.313	.585	300	3.673	1.014	300
520	Theater Workshops	54	85	**			**		
530	Georgetown College Orientation	52	100	1.750	.676	52	3.615	1.078	52
540	Secondary School Enrichment	782	32	1.890	.631	100	4.140	.949	100
550	Morning Physical Fitness	947	100	2.180	.433	100	3.580	1.168	100
560	Special Orientation for 6th Graders	335	31	1.700	.557	100	4.190	1.027	100
570	Summer Camping	902	100	2.192	.483	26	3.000	1.468	26
580	Instrumental Music	530	23	1.890	.581	100	4.150	.984	100
600	Vocational Orientation	355	72	1.950	.497	100	4.150	.973	100
610	MSD JHS & Teacher Training Institute	143	70	1.813	.662	91	4.000	1.069	91

---

* For exact wording of Items 2 and 12, see Student Evaluation Form in Appendix B.

** Data not available.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Teacher Evaluations for Students in Title I Programs in the Summers of 1966 and 1967

			Item 2*							Item 12*						
Code			1966		1967			S.D.		1966		1967			S.D.	
1966	1967	Name of Program	N	Mean	Sample N	Mean	Diff.	1966	1967	N	Mean	N	Mean	Diff.	1966	1967
405	410	Social Adjustment	155	2.239	100	2.190	.049**	.642	.688	149	3.248	100	3.220	.028	1.232	1.064
404	420	Webster School for Girls	41	2.098	20	2.250	.152	.367	.699	39	4.179	20	3.100	1.079	.932	1.179
407	450	Junior High College Prep (Gonzaga)	42	1.952	75	1.867	.085**	.723	.587	42	3.857	75	3.507	.350	1.014	.997
202	500	Primary Summer School	5989	2.351	300	2.313	.038**	.567	.585	5745	3.654	300	3.673	.019**	1.134	1.014
406	530	Georgetown College Orientation	73	1.904	52	1.750	.154**	.666	.676	73	3.904	52	3.615	.289	1.184	1.078
402	540	Secondary School Enrichment	228	1.824	100	1.890	.066	.680	.631	224	4.004	100	4.140	.136**	1.039	.949
212	550	Morning Physical Fitness	300	2.060	100	2.180	.120	.614	.433	379	3.784	100	3.580	.204	1.226	1.168
		Combined Mean	6831	2.309	747	2.136	.173**	.608	.614	6651	3.671	747	3.626	.045	1.109	1.064
		Combined Mean except #500 Primary Summer School	842	2.012	447	2.018	.006	.615	.619	906	3.780	447	3.595	.185	1.105	1.073

*For exact wording of Items 2 and 12, see Student Evaluation Form in Appendix B.

**More favorable in 1967.

objectives, but the downward trend on this variable is in line with the findings of other studies* concerning the general trend in the student attitudes, including cooperativeness.

One further comparison of the means by programs for items 2 and 12 was made. Table 4 compares the average of the summer program instructors' evaluations in both 1966 and 1967 with the average of the two regular school year teacher evaluations for the same programs. On both items 2 and 12, students were rated substantially higher by the summer teachers than by the regular school year teachers in all programs except Georgetown College Orientation and Junior High College Prep--Gonzaga.

Being ranked higher by the summer program teachers might be due not only to the differences in the students' behavior but also to differences in the teachers' perception of the students in different situations. It seems probable that in the summer school atmosphere teachers are more optimistic concerning the abilities of their students than in the regular school year. Also, they are probably more tolerant and permissive. It is known that this optimism is an important factor in education, as it appears to influence the learning efficiency of the students.**

This would seem to support the hypothesis that summer programs in the educational system can play a particularly useful function for education of disadvantaged children because of the difference in attitude of the summer school teacher or instructor.

It should be noted that the lower ratings of both the Junior High College Prep--Gonzaga and the Georgetown College Orientation Programs were by teachers of private schools, who probably had higher expectations and standards of performance than other summer school teachers.

B. Administrator and Teacher Questionnaires

Much of the information contained in the Administrator and Teacher Questionnaires with regard to descriptions and objectives of the programs, staff, participants, problems encountered, and recommendations for future programs, has been used in Section IV ("Description of Programs") of this report.

---

*Dailey and Neyman, op. cit.

**Dailey, John T., and Neyman, C. A., Jr., Research on Evaluation of Programs in the Model School Division. Final Report on Contract No. NS-67129, Government of the District of Columbia. Washington: Education Research Project, The George Washington University, 1968.

TABLE 4

Comparison of Summer School Program Teacher or Instructor Evaluations with Regular School Year Teacher Evaluations

Code	Name of Program	Item 2* - Combined Means: 1966, 1967 summer instructor evaluations	Item 2* - Combined Means: 1965-66, 1966-67 teacher evaluations	Item 2* - Combined Means: Difference between summer & regular school evaluations	Item 12* - Combined Means: 1966, 1967 summer instructor evaluations	Item 12* - Combined Means: 1965-66, 1966-67 teacher evaluations	Item 12* - Combined Means: Difference between summer & regular school evaluations
410	Social Adjustment	2.220	2.776	.556 **	3.237	2.453	.784 **
450	Junior High College Prep (Gonzaga)	1.898	1.900	.002 **	3.795	3.914	.119
500	Primary Summer School	2.349	2.392	.043 **	3.655	3.569	.086 **
530	Georgetown College Orientation	1.840	1.547	.293	3.784	4.524	.740
540	Secondary School Enrichment	1.844	1.922	.078 **	4.046	3.868	.178 **
550	Morning Physical Fitness	2.090	2.281	.191 **	3.741	3.594	.147 **
560	Special Orientation for Sixth Graders	1.874	2.384	.510 **	4.106	3.419	.687 **

*For exact wording of Items 2 and 12, see Student Evaluation Form in Appendix B.

**More favorable in summer evaluations.

NOTE: Uncombined means will be found in Tables 1 and 2.

Both the Administrator Questionnaires and the Teacher Questionnaires contained sections which asked for an indication of which of twenty possible program objectives applied to their particular program. Table 5 shows the responses to this checklist. These have been arranged in the order of the frequency of Administrator responses.

There is considerable agreement on the first five objectives on the list: cultural enrichment, motivation for school, lessening of hostility toward school, pride and self-confidence, and strengthening of communication skills, all of which are the usual deficiencies of children for whom Title I funds are intended. It will be noted that there is also considerable agreement between the teachers and the administrators -- the correlation coefficient between the two rank order lists gives an r of .89.

The largest group of teachers were in the Primary Summer School program. This group constituted approximately one quarter of the total number of evaluations received. Since the program for the younger group of children differed somewhat from all the other programs, the rank order attributed to the objectives on the checklist was somewhat different. Primary Summer School teachers ranked cultural enrichment as the main purpose of their program, but they judged strengthening of reading and communication skills to be equally important in second place on the checklist.

Two very important objectives are ranked very near the bottom of the list: "optimal parent involvement in educational processes" and "optimal community involvement in educational processes." Apparently these objectives have received very little attention in the summer programs as they are set up at present. The importance of parent and community involvement in educational processes as a major factor in the success of the schools and their programs is becoming increasingly apparent. It is believed that the involvement of parents and the community should be definitely stated as objectives of many of the Title I programs and that steps should be taken to implement these objectives in future program planning.

C. Student Questionnaires and Themes

Students in the 7th grade or above in selected summer programs completed a Student Questionnaire and wrote a theme on "What School Means to Me." From 8 summer programs 1576 questionnaires and themes were obtained.

A review of the questionnaires indicated that many of the students preferred summer school to the regular session because the atmosphere was more relaxed, and because the classes were smaller the students were able to obtain more individual help in problem areas.

TABLE 5

Program Objectives, in Rank Order, as Obtained from Administrator and Teacher Questionnaires

Program Objective	Administrator Q. (N=28)	Teacher Q. (N=389)
To increase cultural enrichment	1.5	1
To strengthen student motivation for school	1.5	2
To minimize feelings of hostility and alienation	3	6
To strengthen other communication skills	4.5	3
To instill pride and self-confidence in students and community	4.5	4
To develop more appropriate patterns of student aspirations	6	12
To improve mental health	7	8
To increase teacher preparation for meeting special needs of center-city child	8	9
To strengthen subject-matter areas	9	7
To obtain more effective use of professional & sub-professional personnel	10	14
To strengthen reading skills	11.5	5
To strengthen teacher morale and motivation	11.5	11
To improve instruction	13	15
To improve physical health	14.5	13
To develop more effective patterns of school & class organization	14.5	17
To prepare children for school	16	10
To improve curriculum	17	16
To encourage optimal parent involvement in educational process	18	19.5
To encourage optimal community involvement in educational process	19	18
To facilitate re-entry of dropouts into educational programs	20.5	19.5
Other achievements	20.5	21

NOTE: For exact wording of this checklist, see Appendix B.

In general, the content of the themes indicated that many students were aware of the need for an education to obtain a job and earn a living. A few showed a very negative attitude toward summer school, even though attendance was voluntary. The greatest complaint was about the heat and the lack of air-conditioned classrooms.

D. Limitations of the Analysis

1) In order to ascertain whether or not the boys and girls participating in the various summer programs were "identified" students, it will be necessary to combine summer school data with the other information already on the master tape. The work covered by the present report is of an interim nature and did not include the addition of these data to the master tape.

However, in order to have some estimate as to the population served, a check was made of a sample of students in each summer program to see what percentage were from Title I target-area schools. This information is shown in Table 2 on page 59 of this report.

When the summer school data have been combined with the other information already on the master tape, then it can be determined just what percentage of the participants in each summer program were identified students and what percentage were from Title I target-area schools.

2) The evaluations of this report were based primarily on non-statistical evidence. Toward the end of this regular school year, Student Evaluation Forms will again be filled out by the teachers on all the students in Title I programs. It will then be possible to learn which summer programs caused measurable changes in the students who participated in them.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The range of activities covered in the 1967 summer programs was extensive and included:

- .. strengthening specific academic skills;
- .. improving physical health;
- .. counseling and training for jobs in the vocational field;
- .. special help for students preparing for college;
- .. preparing elementary children for the transition to junior high school;
- .. providing the opportunity for children to develop special talents, such as playing a musical instrument or acting in the theater;
- .. an evening program for high school students who worked during the day;
- .. an opportunity for pregnant school-age girls to continue their education;

.. a chance for children to go to camp for two weeks;
.. individual help for adolescents who had not been able to adjust to regular school;
.. scholarships for bright, adjusted children to participate in leadership training programs in the fields of sociology and international relations; and
.. the continuing services of the Pupil Personnel Department in contacts with the identified students, their parents, and supporting agencies in the community to help the students reach their greatest potential.

Assignment of Priorities

The various Title I summer programs were assigned three levels of priority. The priority assigned to any program was decided by weighing a combination of several factors, among which was the documentable evidence of its contribution toward meeting the special educational needs of students from low-income areas and toward improving their motivation to stay in school. The present report is based upon limited statistical evidence derived from summer school teacher evaluations of their students, and the nonstatistical evidence derived from the judgment of the Project staff based upon interviews with the program administrators, observation of the programs in operation, and review of information from administrators, teachers, and students, as described in this report.

Priority 1 - Those programs which were found to have made a substantial contribution toward meeting the educational needs of the target population of students. Priority 1 has been divided into two groups: Priority 1-A was assigned to those programs which appeared to make the most significant contribution toward better schooling, and Priority 1-B was assigned to those programs which fell slightly behind those in the 1-A group.

Priority 2 - Those programs appearing to have merit as Title I programs but which do not appear to make as significant or measurable a contribution as those in Priority 1.

Priority 3 - Lower priority programs.

These priorities should be considered as interim and subject to revision when additional data are available at the end of the 1967-68 school year from the teacher evaluations, test scores, etc.

The Title I summer programs are listed in alphabetical order by priority categories, followed by a short discussion of the points considered in making the priority assignment for each program.

SUMMER 1967 TITLE I PROGRAMS

Priorities

(in alphabetical order)

Code No.	Title of Program
PRIORITY 1 -	Definite contribution toward better schooling of the students from low-income areas
Priority 1-A (upper)	
580	Instrumental Music
610	Model School Division Junior High School and Teacher Training Institute
500	Primary Summer School
480	Pupil Personnel Services Teams
410	Social Adjustment
430	STAY
570	Summer Camping
420	Webster Girls School
Priority 1-B (lower)	
540	Secondary School Enrichment
470	Summer Occupational Orientation
600	Vocational Orientation
Priority 2 -	Have merit but not as significant as Priority 1 programs
440	Joint Public and Parochial Program -- 15-12
450	Junior High College Prep -- Gonzaga
550	Morning Physical Fitness
460	Summer Scholarships:
461	Sociology Seminars - National Cathedral School
462	International Seminars - St. Albans School
463	Summer Seminar - The Heights School
520	Theater Workshops
Priority 3 -	Low-priority programs
530	Georgetown College Orientation
560	Special Orientation for Sixth Graders
464	Summer Scholarships: Institute of Languages - Georgetown University

Priority 1-A (in alphabetical order)

Instrumental Music. This program provided six weeks of instruction in orchestral music and was a continuation of the regular school year District of Columbia Youth Symphony. While this program was open to all students city-wide and did not serve Title I students exclusively, the student and parent enthusiasm for this program was so great that its continuation in the summer should be given high priority. This is one of the few programs that gave the students from the lower economic strata an opportunity to actively participate in a cultural endeavor with students from all economic strata, thus furthering the cause of socioeconomic integration.

Model School Division Junior High School and Teacher Training Institute. This program provided an opportunity for the Model School Division to test ideas the Division had developed for an innovative curriculum in the area of science. The identical program might not be applicable for next summer, but a similar type institute for testing and training teachers in innovative curriculum of the Model School Division should be given priority. It was shown in previous evaluations that the students who are involved in these institutes benefit greatly.

Primary Summer School. This program served a large population of young children who were underachieving in subject matter, particularly reading. Special attention to these disadvantaged children at this early age can do much to help them succeed in school work in later years.

Pupil Personnel Services Teams. During the summer the Pupil Personnel Services Teams provided continuing contact with the identified students, their parents, the school, and supporting agencies from referral to intervention to follow-up. This approach seems central to the entire Title I program.

Social Adjustment. This program represents a fundamental attack on a very important problem in the dropout area. It was apparently very successful in the summer of 1966 in preparing students to return to their regular schools in September.

STAY. This afternoon and evening program has proved to be extremely effective in providing an opportunity for dropouts to graduate from high school.

Summer Camping. This program allowed 902 identified students to attend a two-week camping session. Follow-up studies made by the Pupil Personnel Teams of children who attended the 1967 camping program showed that the camping experience made a major impact on the lives of these identified students.

Webster Girls School. This program for pregnant girls is doing a good job of meeting the educational needs of girls at a critical time in their lives.

Priority 1-B (in alphabetical order)

Secondary School Enrichment. This program offered noncredit courses to junior and senior high school students, and contributed directly to dropout prevention to the extent that it enabled students to study those subjects in which they have a special interest. Student comments in themes and interviews indicated that they like the summer courses much more than the same work during the regular school year. Students from the 1966 summer program were found to have better school performance and attitudes in the classrooms one year later.

Summer Occupational Orientation. This was a pilot program designed to provide an overall view of the world of work to students in grades 9 through 12. The program included in its objectives part-time employment for the students, but government agencies which had promised jobs could not provide them in sufficient numbers to satisfy the needs of the program.

There was some overlap in this program with similar classes offered in the Vocational Orientation program and also with some courses offered in the Secondary Summer Enrichment. The occupational and vocational training area is so important in helping students to prepare for a career that this type of program should be given high priority. This program included counseling services in the area of vocational information and job conditioning, which are very important for students at the junior high school level to help them in deciding which courses to take in senior high school.

Vocational Orientation. This program offered classes in vocational training, for both boys and girls, in three junior high schools. Students spent the six-week period in training in one particular shop, in contrast to the Summer Occupational Orientation in which students spent one week each in six different shops.

Priority 2 (in alphabetical order)

Joint Public and Parochial Program -- 15-12. This program presented special activities and individual counseling for girls 12 to 15 years of age. The final evaluation as to the effectiveness of this program will depend upon how well these girls perform during the regular school year.

Junior High College Prep -- Gonzaga. This is the third year for this program, designed for 7th- and 8th-grade boys who were underachievers but were believed to have college potential. Part of its value is the concentration on the junior high school boy who still has his senior high school work ahead of him.

Morning Physical Fitness. This summer and regular school year program is designed to improve the students' physical health as well as their motivation and attitudes. The program seems to be achieving its objectives and should be continued if the budget permits.

Summer Scholarships: International Seminars - St. Albans School, and Sociology Seminars - National Cathedral School. Scholarships for programs at the National Cathedral School and at the St. Albans School were awarded to outstanding high school students from Title I schools (in both programs, there was 100% participation of Title I students). In both programs, the students from Title I schools participated in programs with outstanding students from other schools and economic strata, even from other sections of the United States. The students from Title I schools had the advantage of attending programs with a distinguished faculty, excellent facilities, and well-defined imaginative objectives. Both programs were structured to develop leaders in specific areas--in sociology at the National Cathedral School, and in international relations at St. Albans School. Another important achievement of these programs was the insight of each other gained by outstanding students from different races and economic circumstances.

Summer Scholarships: Summer Seminar - The Heights School. Only three children from Title I schools received scholarships to attend the study camp at The Heights School. The involvement of this school should be investigated further for next summer.

Theater Workshops. This was a new program and one of the few specifically oriented to the more cultural areas of education. The program had the services of professional staff from a legitimate theater in Washington. In comparison with the cost per pupil of the majority of other summer programs, this one was high. It is recommended that if the program is continued, it be organized to serve a larger number of students, at lower cost per pupil.

Priority 3 (In alphabetical order)

Georgetown College Orientation. This program was designed to give additional academic preparation to students who showed some potential for college. As conducted during the summer of 1967, this was a very expensive program and was not directly aimed at the prevention of dropouts.

Special Orientation for Sixth Graders. This program was set up to facilitate the entry of elementary school graduates into junior high school. If this program is to continue to be funded under Title I, efforts should be made to enroll more identified children from the target-area schools.

Summer Scholarships: Institute of Languages - Georgetown University. The program at Georgetown University was intended to teach English to children whose language was not English at home; most of the children came from Spanish-speaking homes. A program of this type is definitely needed in the District of Columbia Public Schools, but since most of these children were not from Title I schools, the program should not be funded through Title I. Also, this program should not have been classified as a scholarship program since this was not the nature of this particular program.

Recommendations*

1. While it is understood that the availability of funds for summer school programs is often not assured until late in the school year, every effort should be made to plan programs well in advance of the opening of the summer session. Advance planning is necessary to accomplish the following activities:

a. Enrolling students in appropriate programs. Unless students and their parents know in advance what programs will be offered during the summer, many of the persons who would profit most by the programs will already have made plans for the summer.

b. Obtaining adequate staff. While many excellent and dedicated teachers were found in the summer programs, others who might have been available if programs had been definitely funded early had already made commitments for other summer employment. Staff hired at the last minute is very likely not to measure up to staff carefully selected and trained.

c. Obtaining adequate supplies. Lack of funds with which to purchase essential supplies for such subjects as shop work and art classes made it necessary to use makeshift measures. While innovation in the face of necessity is to be commended, learning may not be as effective.

d. Administrators need adequate time to plan their programs. It takes time to arrange for field trips, resource personnel, and facilities of various kinds. Also, orientation sessions need to be held before school opens so that the teachers and other personnel will be prepared to begin classes immediately.

2. There is a need for better coordination of summer programs. This was particularly true of the three programs at the secondary level which dealt with vocational and occupational training and/or orientation: Summer Occupational Orientation, Secondary School Enrichment, and Vocational Orientation. The objectives of the programs in these areas should be more definitely set out and a decision made as to what type of students each is to serve. These are very important areas for Title I programs, and there should probably be even more effort in this direction.

---

* Recommendations for individual programs are included in the program writeups in Section IV.

3. While research shows that most effective learning takes place when the disadvantaged child is associating with more advantaged fellow-students, every effort should be made to involve Title I target-area students in the Title I summer programs, and particularly those students who have been "identified" as potential dropouts. Table 2 of this report shows that less than 60% of the students were from Title I target-area schools in four of the nineteen programs for which the data were available on the winter school attended. The Pupil Personnel Teams did an excellent job of involving identified students in summer classes, particularly the camping program, but even more effort should be made to do this.

4. The administrators of all summer programs should endeavor to involve the parents of their students in the activities of the programs, particularly the parents of the identified students. Efforts should also be made to involve the community, using demonstrations, exhibits, parents' day, and other devices. The services of the Pupil Personnel Teams could be enlisted to devise ways and means of improving parent and community communication and greater involvement in the summer school activities.

5. As Title I programs are intended to be innovative and experimental, it would follow that some programs would be more effective than others. It seems reasonable, therefore, that the less effective programs should either be dropped or changed in ways to make them more effective. Also, the effective innovative programs should be expanded to meet the needs of more children, hopefully at less cost per pupil after the experimental stage is passed. It would also be desirable that new programs be developed to fill specific needs not met by other programs.

6. Greater efforts should be made to publicize the Title I summer programs, through advance notices, better communications, and feedback to the principals and school staffs. Efforts should be made to make the community more aware of the programs being offered by the schools.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. Further research is required as to the effectiveness of these summer programs, using the Student Evaluation Forms of the classroom teachers during the school year 1967-68. This evaluation will give a pre-test/post-test measure of the participants in the various programs for comparison with students not in programs.

2. Analysis should be made of the factorial structure of the item content of the evaluations made by summer school teachers of their students in comparison with the evaluations made during the regular school year, as well as of other performance variables.

3. Investigation should be made of the contribution of the Student Questionnaires and the 15-minute themes to the measurement of the attitudes and motivations of summer school students, and for comparison of students from Title I target-area schools, particularly identified students, with others in the summer programs.

4. Investigation should be made of the relationship between dropout and summer school attendance. If research shows that there is less likelihood that students who attend summer school will drop out of school, then greater efforts should be made to involve greater numbers of the identified students.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Table A-1 Data Collected - Summer 1967 Programs

Appendix B

Forms	Student Evaluation Form Administrator Questionnaire Teacher Questionnaire Student Questionnaire

TABLE A-1

Data Collected - Summer 1967 Programs

Code	Program	Administrator Q.	Teacher Q.	Student Q.	Theme	Student Evaluation Form	Roster	Enrollment
410	Social Adjustment	2	22	175	175	230	230	327
420	Webster Girls School	1	4	32	32	26	50	53
430	STAY	1	9	254	254			435
440	Joint Public & Parochial--15-12	2	33	89	89	111	170	175
450	JHS College Prep--Gonzaga		8	72	72	75	89	89
460	Summer Scholarships							
461	Sociology Seminars-- National Cathedral School	1					9	9
462	International Seminars-- St. Albans School	1					32	32
463	Summer Seminar-- The Heights School	1				3	3	3
464	Institute of Languages-- Georgetown University	1	5			90	92	93
470	Summer Occupational Orientation	1	20	207	207	235	240	279
500	Primary Summer School		161			4511	3049	4953
520	Theater Workshops	1					54	54
530	Georgetown College Orientation	1		52	52	52	52	52
540	Secondary School Enrichment	4	42	695	695	105	708	782
550	Morning Physical Fitness	2	34			725		947
560	Special Orientation for 6th Gr.	1	21			258	262	335
570	Summer Camping	1	4	71		26	902	902
580	Instrumental Music	1	17			530	530	530
600	Vocational Orientation	3	4	9		127	355	355
610	MSD JHS & Teacher Training Inst.	1	5			143	143	143

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Education Research Project
729 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C., 20005

March 1967

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

PLEASE PRINT

Ident. Number ____________________ (1-7)

Name of School ____________________________________

School Code __________ (32-34)

Name of Pupil ____ (8-22)
Last First Middle

Boy ____ Girl ____ (23)

Present Grade __________ (24-25)

Date of Birth ________ / ________ / ________ (26-31)
Month / Day / Year

Name of Parent or Guardian ____
Last First Middle

Address ____

Please evaluate this student on the following (circle the ones that apply):

1. (35) How well does he apply himself to his school work?
   - A. Above average
   - B. Average
   - C. Below average

2. (36) How well does this pupil do in his school work?
   - A. Above average
   - B. Average
   - C. Below average

3. (37) How well does he get along with the other children?
   - A. Above average
   - B. Average
   - C. Below average

4. (38) How is his emotional maturity?
   - A. Above average
   - B. Average
   - C. Below average

5. (39) How favorable is his attitude toward school?
   - A. Above average
   - B. Average
   - C. Below average

6. (40) How well can you understand him when he speaks?
   - A. Above average
   - B. Average
   - C. Below average

7. (41) How well does he like, or is he learning, to read?
   - A. Above average
   - B. Average
   - C. Below average

8. (42) How does his home environment affect his school performance?
   - A. Favorably
   - B. Neither favorably nor unfavorably
   - C. Unfavorably

9. (43) How good is his health?
   - A. Above average
   - B. Average
   - C. Below average

10. (44) How well does he cooperate with you?
   - A. Above average
   - B. Average
   - C. Below average

Form GWU-C7-11-37

In answering the next eight questions, please indicate where the student stands on each scale by making a check mark in one of the five places.

11.	(45)	DEFIANT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	SUBMISSIVE
12.	(46)	UNCOOPERATIVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COOPERATIVE
13.	(47)	FRIENDLY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HOSTILE
14.	(48)	SHY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	AGGRESSIVE
15.	(49)	IRRESPONSIBLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	RESPONSIBLE
16.	(50)	NEAT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNKEMPT
17.	(51)	FOLLOWER	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LEADER
18.	(52)	ALERT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DULL

19. How many days has this student been absent for any reason since the first of this school year?

(53-54) ____________________ days

20. How many days has he been absent unexcused?

(55-56) ____________________ days

21. Was this student in a special academic class this year?

(57) _____ No
_____ Yes

22. Has he been in any of the following:

(58) _____ No
_____ Yes a. Social Adjustment Class

(59) _____ No
_____ Yes b. Twilight School

(60) _____ No
_____ Yes c. Boys' Jr-Sr High School

23. On the average, what part of his classroom time is spent in a classroom with a teacher-aide present?

(61) _____ None
_____ Some, but less than ½
_____ Over ½ but less than all the time
_____ All the time

THIS SECTION IS TO BE ANSWERED FOR PUPILS IN KINDERGARTEN, JUNIOR PRIMARY, AND FIRST GRADE. PLEASE ANSWER ALL ITEMS AND OPTIONS THAT APPLY.

1. Has the pupil been in Junior Primary?

(62) ____ a. Yes
____ b. No
____ c. Don't know

2. What kindergarten program or programs has this child been in?

(63) ____ a. Public (D.C. schools)
(64) ____ b. Public (other than D.C.)
(65) ____ c. Private
(66) ____ d. None
(67) ____ e. Don't know

3. What pre-kindergarten program did this child attend?

(68) ____ a. Public Summer Head Start (1965)
(69) ____ b. Public Summer Head Start (1966)
(70) ____ c. Private Summer Head Start (1965)
(71) ____ d. Private Summer Head Start (1966)
(72) ____ e. Private Winter Head Start ('64-'65)
(73) ____ f. Private Winter Head Start ('65-'66)
(74) ____ g. Other public pre-K program
(75) ____ h. Other private pre-K program
(76) ____ i. None
(77) ____ j. Don't know

____
Date filled in

____
Teacher's signature

The George Washington University
Education Research Project

Title I Summer Program: ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

ADMINISTRATOR'S NAME__________________________________DATE_____________________

NAME OF PROGRAM______________________________LOCATION__________________________
(Building, Camp site, etc.)

1. Please give a brief description of your program. Tell what you are trying to accomplish, and how you are going about reaching your objectives.
(Use extra pages if necessary)

2. What kinds of students does your program serve? State the number, respectively, of boys and girls in (a) each grade level; (b) each special category, if other than regularly enrolled students.

3. What kinds of Staff do you have? State the number in each category.

4. How did you select and train your Staff? Please supply the information separately for each category of Staff.

5. What determined which students participated in the program? How were they selected or designated?

6. What types of overall problems did you encounter in your program, and how were they resolved? Please explain briefly, listing specific examples.

7. If this type of program were to be repeated, what changes would you recommend for improvement?

8. Of the following program objectives, which do you think were achieved to a significant degree? Check as many as apply.

a. _____ preparing children for school
b. _____ strengthening student motivation for school
c. _____ minimizing feelings of hostility alienation
d. _____ more appropriate patterns of student aspirations
e. _____ cultural enrichment
f. _____ improving physical health
g. _____ improving mental health
h. _____ re-entry of dropouts into educational programs
i. _____ optimal parent involvement in educational process
j. _____ optimal community involvement in educational process
k. _____ strengthening reading skills
l. _____ strenghtening other communication skills
m. _____ strengthening subject-matter areas
n. _____ improving curriculum
o. _____ improving instruction
p. _____ increasing teacher preparation for meeting special needs of center-city child
q. _____ strengthening teacher morale and motivation
r. _____ more effective patterns of school and class organization
s. _____ more effective use of professional and sub-professional personnel
t. _____ instill pride and self-confidence in students and community
u. _____ other achievements, please explain

The George Washington University
Education Research Project

Title I Summer Program: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHER'S NAME________________________________ DATE_______________________
(Specify: Miss, Mrs., Mr.)

NAME OF PROGRAM_________________________LOCATION__________________________
(Building, Camp site, etc.)

1. Please give a brief description of your program. Tell what you are trying to accomplish, and how you are going about reaching your objectives. (Use extra pages, if necessary)

2. What types of overall problems did you encounter in your program, and how were they resolved? Please explain briefly, listing specific examples.

3. If this type of program were to be repeated, what changes would you recommend for improvement?

4. Of the following program objectives, which do you think were achieved to a significant degree? Check as many as apply.

a. _____ preparing children for school

b. _____ strengthening student motivation for school

c. _____ minimizing feelings of hostility alienation

d. _____ more appropriate patterns of student aspirations

e. _____ cultural enrichment

f. _____ improving physical health

g. _____ improving mental health

h. _____ re-entry of dropouts into educational programs

i. _____ optimal parent involvement in educational process

j. _____ optimal community involvement in educational process

k. _____ strengthening reading skills

l. _____ strengthening other communication skills

m. _____ strengthening subject-matter areas

n. _____ improving curriculum

o. _____ improving instruction

p. _____ increasing teacher preparation for meeting special needs of center-city child

q. _____ strengthening teacher morale and motivation

r. _____ more effective patterns of school and class organization

s. _____ more effective use of professional and sub-professional personne

t. _____ instill pride and self-confidence in students and community

u. _____ other achievements, please explain

5. What position will you have in September 1967?

6. What were the greatest challenges and rewards that you found from your participation in this summer's program?

(Use extra pages, if necessary)

I.D. # ____________

The George Washington University
Education Research Project

Title I Summer Program: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE - 7th Grade & Above

Name of Your Summer Program ________________________________

NAME ______________________________ SEX __________
Last First Middle

DATE OF BIRTH ____________________ TODAY'S DATE ____________________
Month Day Year Month Day Year

NAME OF SCHOOL YOU ATTENDED IN MAY 1967 ____________________ GRADE __________

1. Did you attend any kind of a program last summer, during 1966?
Answer ________________________________

2. If you were in a school program last summer, tell what you did there.

3. If you were not in a program during the summer of 1966, tell what you did during the day.

Title I Summer Program: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE 7th Grade & Above

4. What do you like best about the program you are in this summer?

5. What do you like least about the program you are in this summer?

6. Now that you are attending a summer program, is it what you expected it to be? If it is not what you expected, explain how it is different.

7. How would you like the program to be different if you could change it?

8. In what ways do you think this summer program will help you with your regular school work or general education?

9. Write in the space below your thoughts on the topic:

"What School Means to Me"

NOTE: Use back of page if you need more room.